85.2R
1913.2

W913.2

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK II, N. Y.

sigillum · seminarii · theologici · generalis · ecclesiæ · protest
antis · episcopalis · in · civitatibus · foederatis
sermo tuus veritas est
A
Ω

Dean Hoffman Fund

A MANUAL OF CHURCH DOCTRINE

A Manual of Church Doctrine

according to the Church of Scotland

H. J. WOTHERSPOON, D.D.

AND

J. M. KIRKPATRICK, D.D.

SECOND EDITION

Revised and enlarged by

T. F. TORRANCE, D.Theol., D.D.

AND

RONALD SELBY WRIGHT, D.D.

LONDON
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
NEW YORK GLASGOW TORONTO
1960

285.2 R
40913.2

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C.4
GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI KUALA LUMPUR
CAPE TOWN IBADAN NAIROBI ACCRA

140877

First published 1920 by
Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton

This revised edition first published by the
Oxford University Press
1960

© The Trustees of H. J. and A. W. Wotherspoon 1960

Printed in Great Britain by
The Camelot Press Ltd., London and Southampton

CONTENTS

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS vii

FROM THE ORIGINAL PREFACE ix

I. THE CHURCH OF GOD 1
- Its Creation 1
- Its Calling 4
- The Church Visible and Invisible 6
- Catholicity 8

II. THE DOCTRINE OF ORDINANCE 11
- *The Sacraments of the Old Testament 13
- The Sacraments and the Incarnation 14
- The Sacraments 15
- Baptism 21
- Subjects of Baptism 25
- Sequel of Baptism 28
- Form of Confirmation 31
- Note on the Baptism of Infants 36
- The Lord's Supper 38
- The Services of the Church 47
- The Sacramental Life 50

III. DOCTRINE, OR THE WORD 56
- Holy Scripture 56
- Creed of the Church 59
- Faithfulness of the Church of Scotland to Catholic Doctrine 64
- Formal Relation of the Church of Scotland to the Nicene Creed and the Councils 65
- Church of Scotland: Its History as a Branch of the Catholic Church 68

IV. MINISTRY 72
- Orders of Ministry 79
- Ordination 91
- The Ministers of Ordination 93
- Authority to Ordain 98
- The Eldership 99
- The Diaconate 102
- *Order 103
- Note to Chapter IV 105

APPENDIXES 109

A: The Lord's Supper: J. Calvin, *Short Treatise* 109
B: The Real Presence: J. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. xvii, 5f. 110
C: This Sacred Feast: J. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. xvii, 42 111
D: Frequency and Order of Service at the Eucharist: J. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. xvii, 43-44 112
E: Christ's Sacrifice and Ours: J. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. xviii, 13, 16 112
F: A Royal Priesthood: J. Calvin, *Institutes*, IV. xviii, 17 113
G: 'Of the Continuance, Increase and Preservation of the Kirk': *Scots Confession*, 1560, Art. V 114
H: 'Of the Kirk': *Scots Confession*, 1560, Art. XVI 114
I: The Sign of the True Kirk: *Scots Confession*, 1560, Art. XVIII 115
J: *Acts of Assembly:* The Order of Services. June, 1564, No. 3, Dec. 1564, No. 5 115
K: John Knox's Exhortation to Communion 115
L: John Craig's *Catechism* of 1581 116
M: *Ministry:* from John Erskine of Dun's *Letter to the Regent* 118
N: *The Westminster Confession:* Of the Lord's Supper 119
O: Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland in Matters Spiritual 120
P: Baptism: *Book of Common Order*, 1940, and *Westminster Directory*, 1643 121
Q: Order for the Celebration of Holy Communion: *Book of Common Order*, 1940 (outline) 123
R: Continuity of the Ministry: R. Stuart Louden 124

INDEX 127

FOREWORD AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

THERE has been no time, we feel, more opportune and important, both inside and outside Scotland, for a renewed interpretation of the doctrine of that branch of the Catholic Church Reformed which is established in Scotland; and no better basis for this interpretation and understanding than in the *Manual* of the late Drs. H. J. Wotherspoon and J. M. Kirkpatrick, so long out of print. We are, therefore, grateful to the Wotherspoon Trustees for giving us their permission thoroughly to revise this *Manual* in the light of more recent scholarship and in places to expand it in a way we hope would have had the blessing of the original authors.

New sections are marked in the Contents with a *, and Chapter IV on Ministry is expanded most, though all have undergone a very thorough revision of the text and expansion of footnotes.

We are grateful to the Oxford University Press for their wholehearted encouragement throughout, and to members of their staff in Glasgow and in London for the great help given in preparing the book for the press and for valuable advice.

We should also like to acknowledge the generous help of Professor W. D. Maxwell, Dr. J. A. Lamb, the Rev. R. Stuart Louden, and the Rev. G. T. Jamieson of the Wotherspoon Trustees, and to thank the Rev. Hugh Mackay and the Rev. D. A. R. McGregor for undertaking to compile the index. A special word of thanks is due to Mrs. O. Bowditch, who discharged so ably the unenviable task of deciphering a far from tidy manuscript.

Professor Torrance's temporary absence from Edinburgh University as visiting lecturer at Princeton, N.J., enables me to add what should be obvious—that most, if not all, of the revision has been done by him, my small part having been to edit and, as an active Parish Minister, in certain cases, to interpret.

Finally, I am sure he shares my expression of the honour and privilege it is to have been associated with the minds of the two good, kind, and scholarly men whose idea this book was, who in their day were honoured, loved, and respected by our Church and who now surely are 'numbered with the saints'.

R. S. W.

Edinburgh,
Pentecost, 1959

FROM THE ORIGINAL PREFACE

THE intention of the following pages is to set out a point of view from which the writers believe that the Church system of the Church of Scotland may properly be interpreted and received. Their purpose is not controversial, but exegetic: their desire is to show that within the documents by which that Church defines her position there is justification for an explicit adherence to the principles of the Church Historic not only with regard to doctrine, which will hardly be doubted, but also with regard to the nature of the Church itself, to Ordinance generally, and with regard in particular to Sacrament and Ministry. They do not desire to insist that these documents leave room for no other interpretation; the documents are designed to be to a certain extent comprehensive. The Westminster Assembly contained an active Brownist or Independent minority as well as an Anglican element, and the adhesion of both of these was desired.

The standards which resulted do not then represent the full Presbyterian position at the golden period of Presbyterianism, but only its necessary commonplaces in a minimum statement painfully secured. The present writers believe that the principles of interpretation which they use lead to a result which corresponds with the actual intention of the Standards, as that existed in the mind of the Scottish representatives in the Assembly, and present the view which commended the Westminster Standards to the Church of Scotland, and made their adoption by the General Assembly possible. 'The Presbyterian (of the early seventeenth century) no less than the Roman or Anglican, believed in a Church, visible, universal and divinely ordered. . . . The Presbyterian was in fact the High Catholic of Puritanism' (Marriott might have said, 'of the Reformation'), 'and the Genevan type of Catholicism was even less Erastian than the Roman.'[1] The views presented in the following pages are the views which, in the judgement of the writers, lineally represent those of the authors of our Standards as they may be expressed in the manner of our own time; for which therefore something more than legitimacy may be claimed.

[1] Sir J. A. R. Marriott, *Falkland and His Times* (1907), p. 22.

I

The Church of God

ITS CREATION

OUR Lord Jesus Christ, while He was yet with us in the flesh, spoke of His purpose to build on Himself, the Rock, a Church, against which 'the gates of Hades' (i.e. the power of Death) should not prevail; it should be continuous and enduring. He spoke of the flock of God, of which He Himself should be the Shepherd and the Door. He constantly taught a Kingdom of God, which He compared, for example, to a group of virgins going out to watch for the Bridegroom (Himself), or to a household of servants to be entrusted with the goods of their absent Lord (Himself). It appears from His final discourse to His Apostles that the Society, which He designed to create and to leave in the world to represent Him until His return, would be vitally a single whole, organically one as a living plant is one. This oneness it was to derive from Jesus Himself, and from the oneness of the Father and the Incarnate Son. 'I am the true vine', He said, 'and my Father is the husbandman. . . . I am the vine' [i.e. not the vine-stock, but the vine including the branches], 'ye are the branches.'[1] From His prayer to the Father, which followed this discourse, it appears that the Society should consist of (1) those whom the Father had already given to Him, and (2) those who 'should believe upon him through their word'; and that these should be perfected into 'one'.[2] This 'one' is the Church of God.

This one Church did not first come into being with the Incarnation. It came into being with the Covenant of grace and is as old as Creation, but it was separated out and manifested in the specific form that Covenant took with Abraham and Israel. The one Church that existed under the old form or economy of

[1] John xv. 1, 5.

[2] 'Perfected in one' refers to the fulfilment of Christ's self-consecration on behalf of the Church, and therefore to the holiness and unity of the Church in Him. See John xvii. 17–19; and Hebrews ii. 10–12.

the Covenant was given a new form or economy in Christ in whom all God's promises of blessing and redemption are perfectly fulfilled. This one Church gathered up by Christ in Himself, and reconstructed as the New Israel in the Twelve Disciples or Apostles, is the Society of the New Covenant, solemnly inaugurated at the Last Supper and finally fulfilled in His death and resurrection. It has its beginning in creation, its redemption and fulfilment in Christ, and in Him it reaches out to the new creation.[1]

At the time of His Ascension our Lord left behind Him in readiness in the world the constituent elements of the Church in its new form, a nucleus for its future development. There was the Discipleship—the Holy Flock; and in the midst of this, a Ministry—the Apostleship; and these Apostles had in charge the means of grace. He had taught them the Name of the Father, He had taught them to pray, He had taught them the things concerning the Kingdom of God, He had instituted for them the Sacraments; they knew Himself for whom they were to be witnesses, and they knew the great redemptive acts which were to be the substance of their Gospel to the world; and they were clothed by Him with mission and commission to go into all the world, making disciples, baptizing and teaching. All things were ready. Out of the dust God had prepared a Body for His Son, the Second Adam—though as yet it had to be quickened by the breath or Spirit into new life.[2] Our Lord's Ascension was followed by a time of pause and silence. He had commanded the Apostles to wait for that which the Father had promised, the Baptism of the Holy Ghost. When the Paraclete should come, they should receive power and become Christ's witnesses.

On the Fiftieth Day (Pentecost) the promise of the Father was fulfilled. Christ had prayed the Father, and He sent forth that Other who should abide with them. Once more God breathed into the clay, and the Body prepared for Christ arose and lived. The mouths of the Apostles were opened; their understanding was

[1] 'As we believe in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, so do we constantly believe that from the beginning there has been and now is, and to the end of the world will be, one Kirk.' *Scots Confession* of 1560, Art. xvi (see also Art. v in Appendix G, p. 114; and Art. xviii, Appendix H, pp. 114f.

[2] The question which the Apostles addressed to Christ on the very eve of His Ascension is one of the indications that, up to that moment, they were still lacking in spiritual capacity for understanding (Acts i. 6), in spite of the opening of their mind by the risen Christ (Luke xxiv. 45).

quickened. The Spirit brought all things to their remembrance: He took the things of Christ and showed them to them; and they received power, and with great power testified of the Resurrection: they began to preach and to baptize; on that day there were added about three thousand souls. Pentecost is the new-birthday of the Church of God.

The Church is thus a Divine creation, not a self-associated fellowship. It is the product of life, not of mechanism. It is from above—not built by us upon earth, but descending from God out of Heaven, and laying hold of us to assimilate us to its order.[1] It is the immediate sphere of the operation of the Holy Spirit mediated to it through Christ. If we speak of the Church as the City of God, the Holy Spirit is compared[2] to a River of Life flowing continuously to and through it from the Throne of God and of Christ; or if we think of the Church as Christ's Body, we may compare the Holy Spirit to the living relation between the Head and the members. By His mediation of the Holy Spirit Christ rules, Christ acts, Christ teaches, Christ ministers among us; and Christ's ordinances become instruments of Christ's activity. The Paraclete does not speak 'from Himself'.[3] He has no self-originated communication, but whatsoever things He hears He speaks.[4] The truth into which it is promised that the Spirit shall lead the Church is the truth of every word which Christ has spoken.[5] The ordinances which the Spirit honours are those ordinances which Christ has set in the Church. There is no 'Kingdom of the Spirit' known to us; but only a Kingdom of Christ in and by the Spirit. The Church is not an incarnation of the Spirit of God, but it is the Body of Christ on earth and in history, i.e. the community of men and women with which He identifies Himself and which in His grace He reckons to be His own earthly and historical Body. It is constituted as Church only because Christ by pure grace makes it one with Himself.[6] We must

[1] W. Milligan, *The Ascension and Heavenly Priesthood of our Lord*, p. 233.
[2] Rev. xxi. 1. [3] John xvi. 13. [4] Ibid.
[5] John xvi. 13, compare xiv. 26; and *The Westminster Confession of Faith* [hereafter cited as *Conf. of Faith*], i. 6.
[6] 'Christ confers upon us this honour, that He is willing to be esteemed and recognized, not in Himself merely, but also in His members. Hence the same Apostle says elsewhere (Eph. i. 23), that the Church is His *completion*, as though He would, if separated from His members, be incomplete' (J. Calvin, *Comm. on 1 Cor.*, xii. 12). 'There is but one Christ. Yes, the Head and the body make but one Christ, so that you cannot divide the body without dividing Christ' (George Gillespie, *The true Resolution of a present controversy concerning Liberty of Conscience* (1644)).

be careful, then, not to think of the Church as anything apart from Christ or as possessing inherent vitality or power of its own. It has nothing but what from moment to moment is communicated to it by its Lord. Though it is filled with Divine Life, it 'has not life in itself'.[1] It is inspired by the Spirit, but inspired only with the thought which is in Christ's mind. It knows the truth, for it has the faith which has been once for all delivered to it—but it is only a witness to that truth; the Church is in no sense an oracle or source of truth. It can bring forth new things as well as old—but only from the treasury of which it is keeper; and in bringing forth the new cannot deny the old. The Faith, the Ministry, and the Sacraments are all anterior to the Christian Church—given to it, and to be guarded by it as they have been given. The Church owns nothing, but it is a steward, of whom one thing is required—that it be found faithful. The Church has authority, not power; power is of God. It has authority to minister, but no authority over what it ministers. It cannot change the King's Word. It cannot modify Christ's ordinance. It is a servant, not a master of the Law. And it dare not be ashamed of Christ or of His Word, lest He be ashamed of it.

ITS CALLING

The Church's Calling is, then, a Heavenly Calling.[2] As the Father sent Christ into the world, so Christ sends us into the world[3] serving Him, representing Him and united with Him in His Mediatorial offices as *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *King*.[4] He exercises these offices in His unique way as King and Lord and Redeemer. We are called to share in these offices in quite a different but complementary way, as heralds and servants and as redeemed sinners.

(1) In unity with Christ as the Prophet of God, the Church's calling is PROPHETIC.

(*a*) It is *Evangelistic*. It originates in a Mission—the Mission of Christ to the World. The Church is sent to the Nations, to preach the Gospel to every creature and to gather out the Election in readiness for the Advent. No lapse of time can alter the character

[1] John vi. 53. [2] Heb. iii. 1–iv. 13. [3] John xx. 21.

[4] See Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*, 34-45; *The Westminster Larger Catechism*, 42–45; *Conf. of Faith*, Art. viii.

thus impressed upon it in its origin—the Church exists to evangelize.

(*b*) Its calling is further to *testimony*. Its prophetic function is not limited to the preaching of Christ outside of Christendom. Everywhere, within Christendom and without, the Church is surrounded by a world which does not know the Father; and it has to declare the Father by testifying to the Son. The Church is God's witness of the Incarnation, of the Atonement, of the Resurrection, of the Ascension, of Christ's Advent and final glory, and of our assembling to Him to receive the deeds done in the flesh. By the Spirit it has to convict the world's conscience 'of sin and of righteousness and of judgement',[1] preparing the way of the Lord.

(2) In unity with Christ as the one Eternal Priest of God, the Church's calling is PRIESTLY.[2]

(*a*) It is a calling to *worship*.[3] There is a worship in the Spirit and in the truth which God seeks: of that the Church is the appointed Minister. As a body the Church has it in charge to 'hallow the Father's Name', and to present before Him the Memorial of Christ and the Sacrifices of Alms and Praises with which He is well pleased.

(*b*) It is a calling to *intercede*. The Father wills that Christ's voice of pleading heard in Heaven should, by means of the Church, be heard from earth both in behalf of those who are in Christ and also for the world—and for the revelation of God's Kingdom. The Church's calling to intercede is coextensive with that of its Lord, whom it thereby serves. To the measure of its understanding and power, it has to re-echo here the whole supplication of Christ and to reflect to God His whole purpose in Christ.

(*c*) It is a calling to *bless*.[4] There is committed to the Church a Ministry of benediction upon all that is good: upon everything in the natural life which is of God's institution and which is

[1] John xvi. 8.

[2] T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry in the Early Centuries*, I, v; *The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government*, 'Pastors'.

[3] William Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, chs. iv and v; *The Ministers' Manual*, Part i, ch. 1.

[4] See *The Presbyterial Form of Church Government:* 'To bless the people from God, Num. vi. 23, 24, 25, 26. Compared with Rev. i. 4, 5 (where the same blessings, and persons from whom they came, are expressly mentioned), Isa. lxvi. 21, where, under the names of Priests and Levites to be continued under the Gospel, are meant evangelical pastors, who are therefore by office to bless the people.'

according to God's will—upon lawful authority and honest law—upon human affections and unions—on all which because it is not against Christ is for Him. In the Name of God the Church meets the world with Christ's peace: and where the son of peace is, there the peace shall abide.

(*d*) Because in such functions it represents Christ, the Church's calling is to *holiness*. Christ sends out His Church as already consecrated in His self-consecration on its behalf. Therefore it has to cast out of itself the evil, and to keep itself separate to the methods of Heaven. It has to glorify Christ by what it is as a Holy Fellowship and as an embodiment of the Kingdom of God. It has to perfect itself as the instrument of Christ's will.

(3) In unity with Christ, to whom God has given the Kingdom, the calling of the Church is to all the graciousness of HIS ROYALTY and watchfulness of His shepherding.

(*a*) Towards those that are within, the Church's calling is *pastoral*. Through its ministry it has to feed the flock of God, to take the oversight thereof, to lead in paths of righteousness, to fulfil the mission of Christ in subduing us to Himself. It has to deliver to the baptized that One Faith which it has received, to teach them to observe all things whatsoever the Lord has commanded, to train and aid them to walk in the Spirit. There is both an instruction and a discipline for them that are within, with an especial duty to 'feed Christ's lambs' in the godly and Christian upbringing of youth. The Church must 'keep in the Name of God' those whom the Father has given to the Son.

(*b*) Towards all those that are without, the Church's calling is to *mercy*. Representing Christ in His fulness, it has a ministry to need, bodily as well as spiritual. All works of charity lie within the Church's duty. Every work of reclamation or of preservation, all protection of helplessness, or prevention of evil, or defence of the oppressed, or rebuke of injustice, is proper to it. The Church is called to speak and to act for Him who had compassion on the multitude because they were as sheep not having a Shepherd, and its works must agree with its word.

THE CHURCH VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE

'The Catholick or Universal Church which is invisible consists of the whole number of the elect that have been, are, or shall be

gathered into one under Christ the Head thereof: and is the spouse, the body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

'The Visible Church, which is also Catholick or Universal . . . consists of all those throughout the world that profess the true religion, together with their children; and is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the House and Family of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation.'[1]

The distinction here drawn is important. In the knowledge and eternal purpose of God, 'The Holy Catholick Church' of all ages (as above defined) exists and constitutes 'one thing'. In the words of Thomas Boston: 'Christ has not two Churches, one invisible and another visible; but one Church, that in one respect is visible, and in another respect is invisible. Christ is not a Head with two Bodies, but we are "all baptized into one Body", and "mystical Christ is but one", 1 Cor. xii. 13.'[2] It is the whole company of the redeemed, that which God has given to the Son, that which Christ has loved, for which He gave Himself, which at the last He shall present to Himself faultless. From the human point of view this is necessarily 'invisible', since by far the greater part of its existing membership is at rest in Paradise, and part has a place only in God's purpose and is not yet called into being.[3]

Part only, then, of this 'Holy Catholick Church' can be at one moment 'visible'. 'We who are alive' represent in place and time that whole which God alone sees in its completeness. The great procession of the faithful crosses the world's stage—and only such part of it as is actually crossing the stage is visible; and as it passes through the world, a 'Mixed Multitude' (like that which went up with the Hebrews) goes with it and blends with its march[4]—'they are not all Israel which are of Israel'[5] (the seal of God is that the Lord knoweth them that are His):[6] nevertheless this is God's Israel which, as we watch, is on its way, and upon this which we

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxv. 1, 2.

[2] T. Boston, *Who have the right to Baptism, and who are to be baptized?* pp. 200f. By 'mystical Christ' Boston means 'the Head and the members', i.e. the whole Christ including His Church (*Works*, viii, pp. 212f.).

[3] 'These are not two Churches distinct from each other, as Romanists accuse us of believing; they are just two different aspects of one and the same Church: on the one hand, as it is seen and known by God only, who knows all hearts; and on the other hand, as it is recognized by us, who can only judge after the outward appearance. Thus the distinction of the Church as visible and invisible arises solely from the imperfection of our discernment and is really a different mode of viewing the same spiritual body' (J. S. Candlish, *The Christian Salvation*, pp. 64f.).

[4] Exod. xii. 38 [5] Rom. ix. 6. [6] 2 Tim. ii. 19.

can see falls for its day the Church's vocation in the world: to this for the day is committed the stewardship.[1]

'Unto this Catholick Visible Church Christ hath given the Ministry, oracles and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the Saints in this life to the end of the world: and doth by His own presence and Spirit, according to His promise, make them effectual thereunto.'[2]

CATHOLICITY

(*a*) The word *Catholic* means in the first place 'universal'—not confined to one Nation, as election was before under the law.[3] The whole company of the baptized is in the mind of Christ one Society: interruptions of communion within this Society are of man, not of God. The Church is one by bond of nature, as a family is one whether united in friendship or not. Particular (or local) churches are members thereof.[4] For purposes of discipline and order the Church has generally been organized on the basis of locality—'the saints in every place' being grouped together under one authority. The governmental divisions of the Church have as a rule followed secular divisions, and in the first place coincided with the 'city' and its dependent district. When the Empire broke up into nationalities, national churches came to be

[1] The popular conception of two co-existing Churches—a 'Visible Church' a merely outward organization, and an 'Invisible Church' which consists of the truly spiritual members of that outward organization—is without authority in, and indeed is contrary to, our standards. As a matter of fact, no separate society of the truly spiritual exists, and our Lord has explicitly forbidden the attempt to form such a society (Matt. xiii. 29). The distinction drawn by *The Confession of Faith* between the Church Invisible and the Church Visible is the universally admitted distinction between the Holy Catholic Church inclusive, and the 'Church militant here upon earth'. See John Knox, *An Answer to a Letter written by James Tyrie*, *Works*, *VI*, pp. 494f., 501f.

[2] *Conf. of Faith*, xxv. 3. See also *The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government*, 'Of the Church'.

[3] *Conf. of Faith*, xxv. 2; cf. the *Heidelberg Catechism*, Q. 54: 'What do you believe concerning the Holy Catholic Church?'—'That out of the whole human race, from the beginning of the world to its end, the Son of God, by His Spirit and Word, gathers, protects, and preserves for Himself in the unity of the true faith and unto everlasting life, a chosen community; and that I am, and forever shall remain, a living member of the same.' *Craig's Catechism*, 1581: 'Why is the Church called Universal?'—'Because it is spread through the whole world.' 'How many Churches are there in the world?'—'One Church, one Christ: as one Body and the Head.' 'Is it bound to any particular time, place, or persons?'—'No, for then it would not be universal' (edit. by T. F. Torrance, *The School of Faith*, p. 120).

[4] *Conf. of Faith*, xxv. 4.

recognized. These, while professing the same faith and holding the same ordinances, exercised, within limits more or less defined, the right to frame canons (or rules) for their own government, and to follow different usages in worship and (in detail) of custom.

When in the sixteenth century the general corruption of faith and morals led to the Reformation and its protest against the Roman usurpation, the sporadic and gradual nature of the movement in one after another of the national churches which accepted it, led to a pronounced accentuation of their autonomy. While retaining in common the Divine Ordinances and the Catholic Creeds, they adopted, each for itself as it was reformed, 'Confessions' or statements of doctrine, for the guidance of teaching and for testimony: and they regulated their internal policy on different models. They have not thereby changed their identity or broken their continuity. They are the same national churches now reformed, and members of the one visible and Catholic Church which our Standards define.

The Reformers believe that it was the Roman Church that had departed from the Apostolic faith. It was by the Church itself that the Reformation had been effected. The Reformers sought not to destroy the Church as a united and visible body, but to strengthen it and cleanse it by restoring its Apostolic and primitive form. In the eyes of the Reformers there was no real disruption at the Reformation—baptism and ordination were held as valid and the Reformed presbyter emerged from the Roman priesthood; the Catholic Church Reformed was no national sect, but The Universal Kirk.[1]

(*b*) The word 'Catholic' is also used in a secondary sense which it acquired at a very early date, with the rise of heresy and the occurrence of schism. In this sense it is applied to the Church in the direct current of its life, as distinguished from elements which have diverged into by-channels, or which have fallen into separation or into error. The Catholic Faith means the Faith, which, being guaranteed by the Holy Scriptures (the Rule of Faith), has been continuously and permanently held from generation to generation. A Catholic doctrine is one which, deriving from Apostolic delivery, has been held and taught by the Church, and has been guaranteed in the acceptance of it by the flock. It is thus distinguished from sectional opinion. It is

[1] e.g. the *Scots Confession* of 1560, Art. xvi. (Appendix H, pp. 114f.)

distinguished also from doctrine upon subjects which have emerged into attention at periods later than the first period, and which cannot therefore be directly verified in the Apostolic deposit. A Catholic practice is one which is rooted not in local or temporary use, but is immemorial in the Church generally. What can be dated as new at any point in post-apostolic history is at the most something less than Catholic.[1]

(*c*) The word 'Catholic' has also a canonical and juristic sense which is decided by the Edict of Gratian, Valentinian, and Theodosius (A.D. 380): that those are to be called Catholics who believe 'the one Godhead and equal majesty and holy tri-unity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost'. The Scottish Reformers in 1558 had this definition in view when they required that 'the Church be reformed in accordance with the precepts of the New Testament, the writings of the Ancient Fathers, and the Godly and approved laws of the Emperor Justinian'[2] (in whose code the Theodosian Edict had been incorporated). In the same sense the Second Helvetic Confession cites the Edict, and continues: 'Since we are then every one of us of this Faith and Religion, we trust that we shall be held by all not for heretics but for Catholics and Christians.' To that Confession the Church of Scotland adhered in 1566 and 1567, and renewed the adhesion in the Glasgow Assembly of 1638 as incidental to its return to the Presbyterian platform. As a branch of the Reformed Church the Church of Scotland has consistently followed the example of Calvin who sought to restore the face of the Apostolic and Catholic Church by reforming it in accordance with its apostolic foundation and in agreement with the Catholic doctrine of the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church. It was precisely because of this adherence to Catholic doctrine that it has opposed the innovations in doctrine and practice of the Roman Church as detracting from its catholicity.[3]

[1] See T. F. Torrance, *Conflict and Agreement in the Church*, vol. i, pp. 162, 166.

[2] Robert Keith, *History*, I. vi; David Laing, *Knox's History of the Reformation*, i.

[3] See J. Calvin, *Institutes* Bk. iv; *Reply to a Letter by Cardinal Sadoleto to the Senate and People of Geneva* (*Tracts*, I, pp. 25ff.); *The True Method of Reforming the Church and healing her divisions* (*Tracts*, III, pp. 240ff.); John Knox, *An Answer to a Letter written by James Tyrie* (*Works*, VI, pp. 485ff.); *Requirements of the Church of Scotland for Union:—Doctrine* (Tract published by Wm. Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh.)

II

The Doctrine of Ordinance

THE Church of Scotland teaches that the 'outward and ordinary means by which Christ communicates to us the benefits of Redemption are His *Ordinances*, especially the Word, Sacraments, and Prayer'.[1] An ordinance is a thing *ordered.*

Christ has instituted in the Church certain external means for spiritual purposes. In themselves they can have no spiritual effect; and they are administered through persons who of themselves have no power to give them effect. But it is Christ who has ordered and appointed them, and Christ has power in earth as in heaven. It is therefore a rational conclusion, and is moreover an assurance which is constantly and continually verified in Christian experience, that Christ makes good His own institution, and gives effect to His own ordinance. He stands behind the ordinance, and His action follows its action. He makes it efficacious for the end for which He appointed it. We believe this, because we believe in Christ. His command is a promise. It is done in heaven as it is done in earth.

When it is said that these ordinances are the 'outward and ordinary' means of grace, it is implied that these are not the only methods of grace: it is implied that there are also 'inward' and 'extraordinary' operations.

(*a*) There are inward operations of Christ by the same Holy Spirit, in which Christ addresses the soul directly, moves the conscience, or influences the heart. The one kind of operation does not exclude the other: but, on the contrary, both are simultaneously at work in every Christian life.

(*b*) Ordinances are 'ordinary means' of grace, i.e. they are common to us all, and are meant for us all alike. But God has also special dealings in providence with each life, unlike His dealings with any other life—and these are 'extraordinary' means

[1] *The Westminster Shorter Catechism*, 88.

of grace. These may be providential: each life is unique, and 'whatsoever comes to pass' in it, is appointed by Divine love and wisdom. Or they may be of a higher and more personal order, as were the appearance of our Lord to St. Paul in the way to Damascus, the voice that rang in the consciousness of Augustine, and perhaps the vision of Constantine. In a human family the father provides home and food and clothing and education for all his children, making no difference—such is the 'ordinary' provision of the household;[1] yet also with each child he deals differently according to character and need. Christ's ordinances are for the household, the Church, and are for every member of it alike, and they are needful to all as the daily bread; but they do not exclude or make less needful interior operations of the Spirit special to each, or the occasional dispensation by which His love awakens, disciplines, or trains each in the individual relation of that soul to Himself. Both methods—the 'outward' and the 'inward', the 'ordinary' and the 'extraordinary'—are in fact applied to all who are Christ's.

The Spirit whom Christ sends works in manifold ways: in the transcendant freedom of God, and in accordance with the divine economy or dispensation of grace. Christ compares Him in His operation (*a*) to the wind,[2] and (*b*) to the water.[3] The wind 'bloweth where it listeth'—it is recognized, Christ says, only in results: we see the branches tossing in the wind and hear their rustling, but we cannot see the wind itself. Such is the Spirit operating in His divine freedom and presence. But He is also like water, which is poured out for the thirsty to take and drink. Such is the Spirit poured out upon the Church, whose office it is to fulfil within it all the promise and blessings of God in Christ. He is the Spirit sent by Christ along with His creative Word to make the appointed ordinances of Christ effective means of grace, so that through them it is Christ Himself who comes to us in the quickening power of His Spirit. Such is the Spirit who comes to us and awaits us in ordinance. He operates in the transcendent freedom of God's grace—'The wind bloweth where it listeth'; but in the ordinance and grace of God He is poured out like living water. Of Him it is said, 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, *come ye* to the waters,'[4] 'Whosoever will, let him *take* of the water of life freely.'[5]

[1] Luke xii. 42. [2] John iii. 8, &c. [3] John iv. 10, vii. 37–39.
[4] Isa. lv. 1. [5] Rev. xxii. 17.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Church under the Old Testament had its sacraments as the divinely appointed signs and seals of the Covenant of Grace. From the beginning when man fell from God through his disobedience God 'made unto him a most joyful promise, to wit, that *the seed of the woman shall break down the serpent's head*, that is he should destroy the works of the devil', as the *Scots Confession* puts it.[1] 'This promise, as it was repeated and made more clear from time to time; so it was embraced with joy, and most constantly received of all the faithful from Adam to Noah, from Noah to Abraham, from Abraham to David, and so forth to the incarnation of Christ Jesus, all (we mean the faithful Fathers under the Law) did see the joyful day of Jesus Christ, and did rejoice.'[2] With Abraham and Israel this Promise took the form of the Old Covenant or Testament which was ratified and sealed with 'two chief sacraments, to wit, Circumcision and the Passover, the despisers and contemners of which were not reputed for God's people.'[3] These two Sacraments marked out the covenanted sphere of union and communion with God, and were the divinely appointed ordinances extending to the people of God the evangelical promise of blessing and salvation that would embrace all nations. This Covenant represented the gracious will of God to ally Himself with His creatures as their God and Saviour, to commit Himself to His people in fatherly kindness, and to take them into communion with Himself. 'I will be your God and you will be my people. I will be God to you and to your seed after you.'

This is the Covenant of the Old Testament, and it is the same as the Covenant of the New Testament. There is only One Covenant and one Church, or one Covenant people inheriting the Promises in all ages, but under the New Testament the Covenant is given a different economy or dispensation. The *substance* of the Covenant remains the same, although in the old economy it was given under the form of a promise waiting fulfilment, while in the new economy it is given under the form of a promise already fulfilled in Jesus Christ. That is the New Covenant in the Incarnation, in the Body and Blood of Christ. With this change in the economy of the Covenant, there is necessarily a change in the mode of sacramental signification and sealing action, and hence the

[1] *Scots Confession*, 1560, Art. iv. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. Art. xxi.

sacraments of the Old Testament are displaced by the corresponding sacraments of the New Testament. It is indeed in the two sacraments of the Gospel that the real meaning of the sacraments under the Law becomes apparent. 'The Sacraments of the Old Testament, in regard of the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited, were, for substance, the same with those of the New (1 Cor. x. 1, 2, 3, 4).'[1]

THE SACRAMENTS AND THE INCARNATION[2]

In order to our salvation the Eternal Word 'became flesh'[3] and dwelt among us, taking our nature in its completeness—body, soul and spirit—into union with His Deity, to become the instrument of our regeneration. Through the humanity thus assumed God 'took hold'[4] of our nature to redeem and re-fashion it. That nature our Lord carried in His own person throughout His life and death, and by His Resurrection exalted it into a new condition over which death and evil have no power;[5] by His Ascension He obtained for it a place in the Heavenly Order: and so, becoming the Mediator of the Holy Spirit to His Body the Church, He is able to communicate to us the benefit of His Passion and the power of His Resurrection and the fellowship of His Ascension. Human nature as it exists in Him is a new creation[6] in holiness and immortality,[7] and He imparts that nature to us, through the Holy Ghost, by His Word and His ordinances, to recreate us in His own likeness.[8] Believers are 'added to Him',[9] made members of His body[10] which is instinct with His Life.

The redemptive acts of Christ, to accomplish which He 'became flesh', are all accomplished in the body as well as in the Spirit. Scripture lays emphasis on this fact. He 'became partaker' of our flesh and blood that through death He might destroy him that hath the power of death.[11] He 'suffered in the flesh'.[12] He 'bore our sins in His own body on the tree'.[13] We are sanctified by the offered *Will* of Christ, but it is 'through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ'.[14] His victory over death is by the resurrection of the body,

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxvii. 5.

[2] See D. M. Baillie, *The Theology of the Sacraments*, pp. 61ff.

[3] John i. 14. [4] Heb. ii. 14–16. [5] Rom. vi. 9. [6] 2 Cor. v. 17.
[7] Eph. iv. 24. [8] Phil. iii. 21. [9] Acts ii. 47. [10] Eph. v. 30.
[11] Heb. ii. 14–15. [12] 1 Pet. iv. 1. [13] 1 Pet. ii. 24. [14] Heb. x. 10.

in which, being risen, He is Himself and not a ghost,[1] and the issue was for Him an actual ascension into the Heavens.[2]

The method of Redemption therefore is incarnational, in which God adapts Himself to our creaturely existence in order to reconcile us to Himself and lift us up to share in His own divine life and love. It is in accordance with this that the application of Redemption by the Spirit of Christ should proceed, as it does, not only by such means as those of the Word and prayer, but also by *Sacraments*, in which Jesus Christ in His grace condescends to give us Himself in a form suitable for us, and so makes Himself accessible to our frailty and weakness. Here He comes to us under the sign and veil of physical objects specially appointed by Him to represent Him and specially sanctified by Him as instruments of His self-communication. In the Sacraments, therefore, Christ assumes a sensible vehicle and, in association with sign and element for our recognition and appreciation, grants us to share in the mystery of the incarnate life and death and resurrection. The Sacraments result from the fact that Salvation operates by Incarnation; and they import that our relation to Christ is a living relation embracing our whole nature, bodily as well as spiritual.

We are not only 'one Spirit'[3] with the Lord, but we are also of His Body. The Sacraments are, then, an essential part of the Gospel, and their doctrine is the seal and crown of the promise and assurance of the Gospel, intimately related to the supreme hope of the resurrection.[4]

THE SACRAMENTS

A Sacrament is an Ordinance instituted by Christ, in which, by material elements ('sensible signs') used as He has appointed, He Himself and His benefits are signified, sealed, and applied to believers.[5]

The word 'Sacrament' is not found in Scripture, and it has no exact equivalent in the language in which the New Testament is written. It was used very early in the history of the Church as the

[1] Luke xxiv. 39. [2] Acts i. 9. [3] 1 Cor. vi. 17. [4] John vi. 54.

[5] *Conf. of Faith.* xxvii. 1. See also *Larger Catechism*, 162, *Shorter Catechism*, 92. In the Reformation Catechisms of the Church of Scotland, the sacraments are expounded under *Thanksgiving*, i.e. as acts of worship and prayer. See especially *Craig's Catechism*, 1581, 'The Fourth Part of God's Honour: Thanksgiving'.

Latin translation of *mysterion*, especially when used of divine things, as in Eph. i. 9; iii. 3–9, 32; Col. i. 27: 1 Tim. iii. 16; which refer to the revelation of the mystery fulfilled in the Incarnation. A common use of *sacramentum* in Latin was for the formal oath which a soldier gave to his commander on enlisting. Calvin pointed out that the Early Church took this over in a changed form and 'made it the act whereby the *commander admits* soldiers to his ranks'.[1] In this sense also it was commonly applied to Baptism. Afterwards it came to be used of the Holy Communion as well, since in communicating the Christian renews his baptismal pledge. Thus not only was it frequently employed in the Latin translation of the New Testament, but it came to refer to Baptism and Eucharist as the holy ordinances appointed for the dispensation of the mysteries of God; as the equivalent of the Greek word 'mystery';[2] and in the fourth and fifth centuries it was accordingly used for many sacred rites or ceremonies, such as the laying on of hands after Baptism, the separate elements in the Holy Communion, the clauses of the Lord's Prayer, &c.[3] In the Middle Ages it became technical, and came to be restricted to certain principal rites which were regarded as covering the administration of the means of Grace. Of these, however, two had always been recognized as pre-eminent and on a plane by themselves, namely, Baptism and the Holy Communion: and the Reformers unanimously inclined to restrict the name Sacrament to these.[4] These two Ordinances stand alone among our Lord's Institutions in their use of material elements (as well as word and action) for spiritual purpose, and in their universality[5] of application. The

[1] J. Calvin, *Institutes* IV. xiv. 13.

[2] See *The Mystery of the Lord's Supper*, by Robert Bruce (trs. T. F. Torrance), pp. 40, 52.

[3] See J. Bingham, *The Antiquities of the Christian Church*, xii. 1, 4.

[4] 'We acknowledge and confess that we now in the time of the Evangel have two chief Sacraments only, instituted by the Lord Jesus, and commanded to be used of all those that will be reputed members of His Body' (*Scots Confession*, xxii). The phrase 'two chief' sacraments may be noted; Calvin did not object to Ordination being called a Sacrament, although he would not number it among the ordinary Sacraments, 'because it is not ordinary or common to all believers, but is a special rite for a certain function.' *Institutes* IV. xiv. 20, xix. 28.

[5] 'To be used of all' (see previous note). Cf. Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*: 'There are only two Sacraments common to all which the Lord Jesus has instituted for the whole company of the faithful. Baptism is for us a kind of entrance into the Church of God, for it testifies that instead of us being strangers to Him, God receives us as members of His family. The Supper testifies that God as a good Father carefully feeds and refreshes the members of His household' (*The School of Faith*, p. 56).

Church of Scotland adopts this restriction of the term.[1] There are two such ordinances and only two, because these two cover the whole field of the Christian Life. The one is the Sacrament of entrance into life in Christ, the other of abiding and of growth in that life. There is no room for any third ordinance of parallel scope or of comparable importance.

'A Sacrament has two parts' (*Larger Catechism*, 163): the one 'an outward and sensible sign used according to Christ's appointment', the other 'an inward and spiritual grace thereby signified'. Neither of these, the sign or the grace,[2] is by itself the Sacrament; a Sacrament exists where sign and grace are brought together into one operation and constitute a single action; so that where the sign is, there is the grace, and so that what the sign signifies simultaneously takes place in the spiritual region.[3] This may be illustrated from our own double constitution in body and soul. The body without the soul is not the man, but is only a corpse: the soul without the body is not the man, but is only a ghost. In life, soul and body are found together and constitute one man. The soul acts by means of the body; the body receives life from the soul. Thus, in intercourse with a friend, hand of flesh grasps hand of flesh in greeting: lips of flesh speak to fleshly organs of hearing; but it is soul which by these outward means greets soul, and it is mind which speaks to mind. This is at least analogous to Christ's meeting with us in Sacraments. The outward sign is the *body* of the Sacrament; Christ by the Holy Spirit is the *life* and *soul* of the Sacrament.[4]

'There is in every Sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence it comes to pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.'[5]

A Sacrament operates in three manners: its outward part (the

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxvii. 4; *Larger Catechism*, 164; *Shorter Catechism*, 93.

[2] By 'grace' is meant *Christ Himself* in His Grace, i.e. 'Christ clothed with His Gospel', 'Christ and His graces', 'Christ and His benefits'. Robert Bruce describes the thing signified as 'the whole Christ with His whole gifts, benefits and graces, applied and given to my soul' (op. cit., p. 45); or as 'the whole Christ, God and man, without separation of natures, and without distinction of His substance from His graces' (pp. 45f.).

[3] Robert Bruce (op. cit.), pp. 42ff.; *Craig's Catechism*, 1581, *The School of Faith*, pp. 149f.

[4] 'The Spiritual part of both [Sacraments] is Christ and His benefits.' (*Larger Catechism*, 176.)

[5] *Conf. of Faith*, xxvii. 2; cf. *Scots Confession* 1560, Art. xvi.

sign) '*signifies*, *seals*, and *applies*' its spiritual part or content.[1]

(1) *It signifies.* This is to be understood in an *effective* sense (*signum facere*) as well as a *cognitive* sense. The sign is appropriate to the grace. Baptism manifestly imports cleansing: The Holy Communion manifestly imports nourishment; and so of the details of each Sacrament, which are individually and designedly symbolic of truth. The sign and the thing signified correspond to each other; else the one would not be a sign of the other.[2]

(2) *It also seals.* That is to say, it conveys in an emphatic and personal manner divine ratification; it indicates the individual who receives the Sacrament as himself the object of God's gracious blessing; and it marks him (to himself, to the Church, before man and before God) as being within God's Govenant and one of God's chosen flock.[3]

(3) *It applies* (or 'exhibits': a word which, as used in theological documents, has the same meaning as 'applies'), that is to say, it actually conveys and confers its spiritual part. What a Sacrament signifies, seals, and applies is the truth and grace of Christ, not 'truth' by itself or 'grace' by itself but *Christ* who is full of grace and truth, so that it is out of His fullness that we receive. It is the efficient instrument of a Divine operation and a medium of grace which cannot be separated from the Divine Giver. It effects that

[1] *Larger Catechism*, 162; *Shorter Catechism*, 92. See R. Bruce, op. cit., p. 106.

[2] The Sacraments are obviously symbolic. But they are more. The Church of Scotland teaches that what is only symbolic is not sacramental. 'A Sacrament has two parts', and symbol is only one of them. A Sacrament 'applies' and 'exhibits' as well as 'signifies' or 'represents'. In this the Ordinances of the New Testament differ from those of the Old Testament, which promised but did not yet give full participation in the reality signified. The Baptism of John was not a sacrament in the Christian sense (see Acts xix. 1–7). It was only when that rite was filled with content in Christ that it was transformed into Christian Baptism. 'The grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost' (*Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 6, Of Baptism). 'We utterly damne the vanitie of those that affirme Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs. . . whosoever slandereth us, as that we affirme and believe Sacraments to be naked and bare signs, do injurie to us, and speak against the manifest truth' (*Scots Confession*, xxii).

[3] *Conf. of Faith*, xxvii. 1; *Larger Catechism*, 162; cf. Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*, 312: 'Seeing it is the proper office of the Holy Spirit to *seal* the promises of God in our hearts, how do you attribute this to the Sacraments?' —'There is a great difference between the one and the other. The Spirit of God is in very truth the only One who can touch and move our hearts, enlighten our minds, and assure our consciences, so that all this ought to be judged as His own work, that praise may be ascribed to Him alone. Nevertheless, the Lord Himself makes use of the Sacraments as inferior instruments according as it seems good to Him, without in any way detracting from the powers of His Spirit.'

which it symbolizes because what it signifies, Christ does.[1] In this it is a Sacrament; and in this a Sacrament differs from the merely symbolic.[2] Other actions may 'seal', as, for example, Benediction; and may unite symbolic action with the Word, as, for example, the lifted hand in Benediction: but these are not therefore Sacraments in the sense of the definition here adopted. They lack the 'sensible signs'—the Elements (of water, bread, wine) which link the Sacrament proper to the method of the Incarnation. It is possible to invent instructive ceremony, or to devise significant symbolism, or to employ rites which shall appeal to the heart by recalling the history or suggesting the doctrine of the Gospel; but it is impossible to invest such things with efficacy, or to create for them a 'spiritual part', or to fill them with Christ. The Church cannot institute a Sacrament.

The true Minister of the Sacraments is Christ: i.e. the action in each Sacrament is proper to Christ alone. None but He can wash away sin, or can give the Holy Spirit, or can instil life. It is proper to Himself to show His own death for us: He alone can give Himself to be our food. The commissioned Ministry acts in His Name and on His behalf; as the Baptist was nothing but only a Voice, so they are but a hand by which the Lord from Heaven carries out His proper work among us. The Ministry has the *authority* to minister: the *power* is in Christ.

The immediate Agent in the Sacraments is the Holy Ghost sent forth through Jesus Christ. That which we see of them is only the outward means or instrument: it is the Holy Spirit alone who makes them efficacious.[3] He conveys to us 'Christ and His benefits',

[1] The Church's Catechisms speak of the Sacraments, therefore, as Christ's 'inferior instruments' (Calvin) or 'the ordinary or outward instruments of Salvation' (Craig), 'instruments of the Spirit' (Craig and Duncan). *The School of Faith*, pp. 54f., 99, 136, 148, 284.

[2] This difference appears the more clearly if we contrast the two symbolic actions done by our Lord on 'the night on which He was betrayed':

(*a*) He washed the disciples' feet, and He said, 'Ye ought also to wash one another's feet.'

(*b*) He took bread and blessed and brake it, and likewise the cup also, and said, 'This do for My Memorial.' To outward appearance the two actions closely resembled each other in character, and His language in the two cases is not dissimilar. But the latter is a Sacrament—the former is not. One is for grace—the other is only for edification.

[3] Cf. R. Bruce, op. cit., p. 45. 'Strictly speaking, no one has power to deliver Christ but God the Father, or He Himself. No one has power to deliver the Mediator, but His Own Spirit. Nevertheless, it has pleased God to use some instruments and means by which He would deliver Christ Jesus to us. The means are these: the ministry of the Word, and the ministry of the Sacraments;

making the Sacraments 'effectual'.[1] Apart from His action in them, they could be nothing: there is no 'virtue in them, nor in him that doth administer them'.[2] Our whole faith as regards the Sacraments is *faith in Christ* that He stands over His own Ordinance, fulfilling what it implies: and *faith in the Holy Ghost*, that He honours Christ's Word, taking the things of Christ and making them ours, so that what Christ wills to do for us is done.

On this account it is that the Sacraments, which to unintelligent apprehension might seem 'external' things, or at least less spiritual than other ordinances such as the Word or prayer, are the most spiritual of all. Except to faith they are nothing, and except to the spiritual man they are little. It is plain that their 'outward part'—the washing of the skin with water,[3] or the feeding upon bread and wine,[4] can have of itself no effect upon the soul. It is self-evident that 'efficacy'[5] must in such a case depend upon the presence and action of the Holy Ghost. Faith is thrown entirely upon Him to find anything at all in Sacraments. They are nothing in the world except what He makes them; they contain nothing unless what is by Him imported into them. The soul coming to the Sacraments is *compelled* to look through their apparatus of 'sensible sign' (as one looks through, and not at, the glass of a window) to Christ and His benefits, and to the operation of the Holy Ghost as He follows Christ's Word.

Faith is then required for our assimilation of all the blessings that the Sacraments convey. Faith is the correspondence of the human will with the Divine action. To come in faith to a Sacrament is to come to it ENTIRELY, soul as well as body: the soul seeking it, grasping it, yielding to it, apprehending it in its spiritual part, as the body apprehends and receives its outward part or sign. The whole man then comes to a whole Sacrament. To come without faith to a Sacrament is not to come to the Sacrament, but only to come in a bodily way to the outward part of the Sacrament. In such a case, the spiritual part is there, and is offered—in a sense (so far as the Divine faithfulness is involved) is bestowed, BUT IT IS NOT RECEIVED—the spiritual in the man is

[1] *Larger Catechism*, 161. [2] *Shorter Catechism*, 91. [3] 1 Pet. iii. 21.
[4] 1 Cor. x. 16. [5] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 6, 'Of Baptism'.

and because He uses these as means to deliver Christ, they are said to deliver Him. But here you have to distinguish between the principal efficient deliverer, and the instrumental efficient deliverer, which is the Word and Sacraments. If we keep this distinction, both these are true: God by His Word, and God by His Spirit, deliver Christ Jesus to you. I call them signs, then, because God has made them potent instruments to deliver the same thing they signify.'

not accessible to the spiritual in the Sacrament. Christ with His grace is there—no failure on Christ's part is possible; but there is failure on the part of the recipient: the living water is held to his lips, but HE DOES NOT DRINK. Thus the grace of the Sacrament is to him for judgement, not for Salvation.[1]

Faith, however, can take out of a Sacrament only what is in the Sacrament. Faith creates nothing: it seeks and receives. The grace which is in the Sacrament does not depend upon our faith; but our obtaining it from the Sacrament does depend upon our faith. The spiritual part of the Sacrament is the same, whatever we believe or do not believe; but unless we believe, we shall not seek or take it.[2] A vessel is not filled with water by our belief that it contains water; but unless we believe it to contain water we shall not attempt to drink from it. Christ said to the woman who touched His garment, 'Thy faith hath saved thee'—for it was her faith which had caused her to touch His garment. But the efficacious cause of her healing was 'virtue which went out from Christ'; and virtue went out from Christ because there was virtue in Christ. If the woman had touched any one of the disciples, mistaking him for Christ, her faith would have been the same, but she would not have been healed; no virtue would have gone out from that disciple, because in a disciple there was no 'virtue'. Faith is not creative, but receptive.

BAPTISM

In common with the Church of God generally, the Church of Scotland teaches that 'Baptism is a *Sacrament*'—that is to say, that it has two parts, an outward and visible sign, and a corresponding operation of the Spirit.[3] It signifies and seals;[4] but it also *applies* what it signifies.

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 8.

[2] Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*: 'Although the unbelievers and the wicked make of none effect the grace offered to them through the Sacraments, yet it does not follow that the sacred nature of the Sacraments is also made of none effect. How, then, and when do the Sacraments produce this effect? When we receive them in faith, seeking Jesus Christ alone and His grace in them' (op. cit., p. 55).

[3] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 1. Cf. also the *Westminster Directory for Public Worship*, 'Of Baptism', which enjoins prayer to this effect: 'That He would join the inward Baptism of the Spirit with the outward Baptism of water; make this Baptism to the infant a seal of adoption, remission of sins, regeneration, and eternal life, and all other promises of the Covenant of Grace. . . .'

[4] *The Book of Common Order*, 1940, 'Order for the Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism to Infants': 'The Sacrament thus instituted is a sign and

The outward part in this Sacrament is washing with water in the name of the Holy Trinity.[1]

The inward part is 'engrafting' into Christ, regeneration, remission of sins, and giving up unto God.[2]

It is not merely for the admission of the person baptized into the visible Church: Baptism is 'into Christ'.[3] Baptism has efficacy.[4] It not only 'offers', but in it the Holy Ghost really 'exhibits' (i.e. applies) and confers what is promised.[5] This grace endures; and its possession is a constant reason, on the one hand, for penitence in that we fall short of or walk contrary to it; on the other hand, it is a ground of confidence; it is a background of faith, and an ever-present motive of conduct.[6]

This teaching of our Church is to be understood and received in view of the fact that Baptism is the act of God. In Baptism the baptized person does nothing, but only surrenders himself to a Divine operation. True, he comes to Baptism or follows it with confession of faith, renunciation of hindrance, and promise of fidelity. But these are not parts of Baptism; they are requirements of Baptism—factors in its proper use. In Baptism itself the baptized is passive; so much so that the Scripture compares it to the act of dying, as the extreme instance of passive yielding into God's hands; or even compares it to the burial of the dead.[7] When, therefore, Scripture speaks of this or that as done in Baptism, it is the act of God of which it speaks, not the subsequent response of man to that act. On the Divine side all is real and complete in Christ. God does for us whatever is needful for our being put into a state of grace. Of that we can speak confidently. There is not Yea and Nay with God.[8] The contents attributed to Baptism are all of them acts of God; *He* engrafts; *He* regenerates; *He* remits sin; *He* calls and 'engages' us to be the Lord's. God does it, and it is done. But nothing is asserted as to our acceptance or use of this

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 2.

[2] Ibid., xxviii. 1; *Larger Catechism*, 165; *Directory*, 'Exhortation'.

[3] Ibid., xxviii. 1. See John Warden of Gargunnock, *A Practical Essay on the Sacrament of Baptism*, pp. 37, 55f., &c.

[4] Ibid., xxvii. 6. [5] Ibid.

[6] *Larger Catechism*, 167; *Directory*, 'Exhortation'.

[7] Rom. vi. 3–5; Col. ii. 12. [8] 2 Cor. i. 20.

seal of our ingrafting into Christ; of forgiveness of sins by His blood, and regeneration by His Spirit, and of adoption and regeneration unto everlasting life. By this Sacrament we are solemnly admitted into His Church. . . .' (see Appendix P, p. 121).

grace, nor of our answer to this calling. Baptism is not the Sacrament of what we do, but a Sacrament of what God has already done in Christ, and therefore of what He offers to us in the Gospel. It is a Sacrament of the Gospel, not of our response to the Gospel, although it requires response from us. We ought in answer to repent, to believe, to turn to God with all our heart, to hold to Christ and to grow up into Him. But Baptism does not ensure our doing of any of these things. It only calls for them and makes them possible. No one speaks of Baptismal repentance or of Baptismal conversion, for repenting and turning to God are actions which God gives us grace to do, not things that God does for us. Grace may be received in vain. What is grafted may wither. What is generated may not come to birth. What is born may die. The forgiven may go on to sin. The son may prove prodigal and go from his father's house. Yet the grafting, the generating, the birth, the adoption took place.[1] What, then, we say of Baptism and its effect we do not say of man's response to grace, which is uncertain, but of God's grace, which is sure. Much is true of Baptism which may not be true of each baptized person. We say, 'This God has done for you: what manner of man ought you to be?' The comparisons used in Scripture to explain the operations of Baptism are such as engrafting,[2] building,[3] adoption,[4] or naturalization.[5] One idea runs through them—that we are by nature in one condition, parts of a certain whole: that we are by grace detached from that whole: and that we are transferred into a new whole and made organically parts of that instead.[6] A shoot

[1] Cf. Calvin's *Comm. on Rom.* xi. 22: 'The children of the faithful are grafted in, to whom the promise is due by the Covenant with their fathers; secondly, they are also grafted in who conceive the seed of the Gospel in them but which either takes no root or is choked before it bears fruit; thirdly, the elect are grafted in, that is those who are illuminated by the inscrutable purpose of God unto eternal life. The first sort are cut off when they refuse the promise given to their fathers, or else do not receive it through their unthankfulness: the second when the seed of the Gospel withers, and is corrupted in them.' See also J. Forbes of Corse, *Instructiones*, x. 10.

[2] Rom. xi. 17–19. [3] 1 Pet. ii. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 9.

[4] Gal. iv. 5; Eph. i. 5. [5] Eph. ii. 12–13; Phil. iii. 20.

[6] 'Baptism . . . testifies also to our new birth, that we are begotten spiritually into a heavenly life. It testifies further to our union with the Body of Christ. It is also a seal as well as a testimony. It not only testifies but seals this up in our hearts, and makes us in our hearts taste the heavenly life already begun in us—i.e. the fact that we are translated from the death in which we were conceived, and inserted into the Body of Christ' (R. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 73f.). Cf. John Willison, *Works*, pp. 459, 461, where Baptism is spoken of as 'a breaking off from the old stock of nature and in ingrafting into Christ', and Thomas Boston, *Fourfold State*, *Works*, viii, p. 178.

grows on one plant, it is cut from it and inserted into another plant, of which it is designed to become a branch. A stone is originally part of the quarry bed; it is rent loose from that and built into the Temple wall. A child is naturally of its own family—it is taken out of that family and adopted into another. A man is born citizen of one country and renounces that citizenship that he may be naturalized into a new allegiance. So in God's dealings with us—we are 'by nature children of wrath', children of the First Adam, shoots of the wild olive, citizens of this world; and we are called out of darkness, made members of the Second Adam, liberated from bondage, brought into God's family, grafted into Christ, made citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven, in which sin is forgiven, in which grace abounds. We are transferred to a new plane of life, lifted up into a new sphere, brought within the operations of the Holy Spirit who dwells in the Body of Christ; into a new world of life and light and love and peace and hope. It is God Who does this: we have not chosen Him, but He has chosen us;[1] if we love Him, it is because He has loved us. God is first; all is of grace; and of this grace Baptism is the Sacrament, 'signifying, sealing, and applying' it. It marks for the individual God's purpose for him. 'Christ died for the world'—but now: Christ died for this man. 'God has chosen some'—but now: God has chosen YOU. And He translates you into the Kingdom of His dear Son. This change of status and sphere is compared to a new birth: and the act of God in according it is compared to an act of spiritual generation.[2] Grace is never mechanical, never compulsory—but without Divine Grace we can do nothing. Grace may be neglected and 'unimproved'; it may be received to condemnation rather than to salvation: but in order that there may be any response on our part to the great Redemptive acts of God, God's own help is necessary. We may believe, then, that with God's calling there is given God's Spirit. It is at least made possible that the soul should meet mercy with repentance, and love with faith. Baptism is not a mockery. It is 'of the Spirit' as well as 'of water'. Whether by the very fact of the introduction of the baptized by Baptism into the sphere of the Spirit's blessing and operation, or whether by direct action of the Holy Spirit upon the soul's effective dispositions, or whether by the implanting of new life by the Holy Spirit in the soul, we must

[1] John xv. 16. [2] John iii. 5; Titus iii. 5.

believe that there is constituted for us in our Baptism a real opportunity, and that the Divine 'calling and election' which it unquestionably bestows is sincere. Our faith in God as true seems to imply and to demand this further faith.

It is this faith in God which is expressed when regeneration is said to be part of the content of Baptism.[1] What is meant is the antecedent act of God, whatever that be, which enables for life in Christ. The assertion of regeneration stands for two things, both of the greatest evangelic importance: (1) for the prerogative of God to be first in our salvation; (2) for the right and duty of the baptized man to exercise faith in God through Christ, and to 'turn to the Lord' with full assurance that God purposes his salvation: 'I will arise and go *to my Father*'. We know that 'God for Christ's sake has forgiven us', and that we 'are begotten again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ'. God has given us to Christ. We find ourselves bound to faith and holiness as a man is bound by the ties of blood to natural affection in his home, or to loyalty to his nation and country—debts which are in like manner created for him by the act of God, and which come upon him with his life itself. The goodness of God leads us to repentance. The love of Christ constrains us. God 'engages us to be His'.

SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM

The Church of Scotland further teaches that Baptism is to be administered to the children who are born within the Kingdom of God, that is, concretely, within the people of God, who mark out the sphere on earth where God rules through His Word and Spirit. Such has been the immemorial practice of the Universal Church. Our Lord has taught us[2] that the little child is the ideal citizen of that Kingdom—'of such' it consists; and it receives them, for in seal of His words Christ took children into His arms and blessed them—and they were blessed. So far from the children being

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 1; *Larger Catechism*, 165, &c. See Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*: 'Baptism consists of two parts. The Lord represents to us in it, first, the forgiveness of our sins and secondly, our regeneration or spiritual revival. . . . The beginning of our regeneration and its end is our becoming new creatures, through the Spirit of God' (op. cit., p. 57). So also *The Heidelberg Catechism* (p. 81), *Craig's Catechism*, 1581 (p. 152), *The New Catechism* (p. 180) and *The Latin Catechism* (p. 285). This element is omitted from the *Westminster Shorter Catechism*.

[2] Matt. xix. 14.

required to depart until they shall become adult sinners, our Lord taught that the adult must become as the little child in order to come into the Kingdom. It was in the course of invitation to Baptism[1] that St. Peter said 'the promise is unto you and to your children', for the little children of believing parents are not outwith the Covenant community, the Household and Kingdom of God, but within it. The Heavenly Father takes them for His own, brings them into the blessing of His Church in the Baptism of the Spirit, graciously grants them to share in the inheritance of the sons of God, and therefore sets His seal upon them.

Baptism is the act of God: we can do no more than be passive under His gracious touch—the condition of His mercy is that we do not resist it. In the child there is no resistance;[2] in the child the soul awaits the entrance of grace; it is plastic to the influences of the Holy Spirit—'the Lord, the Life-giver'. In the Baptism of an adult there must always be present a certain fear lest 'he have neither part nor lot in that matter'[3]—God alone knows the heart; but in the Baptism of a little child, thanksgiving may be unshadowed, confident. For we know what God has therein done. The rest is still uncertain—we cannot foresee whether this soul will 'work out its salvation' or 'make its calling and election sure'; but we have good hope of it through grace.

The Church is the servant of God's Ordinance, not its master: it can only 'give the bread in due season' and minister where it is sent. It cannot baptize where the Gospel is not proclaimed, or outside the sphere where the mighty acts of God in Christ are effectually operative through the Word and Spirit. It can only follow the work of the Spirit in calling out and in building up the Household of God. Its duty in baptizing is to follow the Divine election; and it dare go no further. It seeks for Baptism those 'to whom the grace belongeth'.[4] In the case of adults this is indicated by their profession of faith and repentance; in the case of infants the indication must be sought in the appointment of God's providence.

[1] Acts ii. 39.; cf. Deut. xxix. 15. See *The Biblical Doctrine of Baptism* (St. Andrew Press, Edinburgh, 1958), pp. 47ff.

[2] As the way to enter the Kingdom of God is as a child (Mark x. 15) so the most natural way to be baptized is as a child. Cf. J. S. Candlish: 'There is nothing symbolized in Baptism of which infants are not capable. It represents that part of the application of redemption in which man is passive, namely, regeneration, and not that in which he is active, namely, faith and repentance. Now infants are capable of regeneration' (*The Christian Salvation*, p. 163).

[3] Acts viii. 21. [4] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 6.

In practice this appointment is recognized where there is offered a provision of due sponsorship. It is indubitable in the case of 'infants of one or both believing parents'. But in the failure of the parent (by absence, death, insanity, or moral incapacity) his place may be taken by some Christian friend'.[1] The law of the Church provides (Act of Assembly, 1712) that 'if parents be dead or absent, or grossly ignorant, or under scandal or contumacious', another sponsor is to present the child—a relation, if possible; and that in the case of foundlings the Kirk Session is to act in this capacity, so that no children in the land may remain unbaptized.[2] What the Church requires as a condition of the Baptism of an infant is, then, reasonable guarantee that the infant shall be reared in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Where this prospect exists, the Church recognizes providential indication of a call to baptize. The child may then be regarded as a disciple[3] and the proper subject of the precept to baptize such and to teach them all that Christ has commanded. Where such prospect is wanting, the Church dare not involve a soul in the responsibility which Baptism constitutes.

The Church of Scotland enacts that the person baptizing shall be an ordained Minister.[4] The general rule of the Universal Church has been that the presbyter is ordinarily the Minister of both Sacraments, that Deacons may baptize by special permission, and that in extreme cases of urgent necessity Baptism by laymen is, if irregular, still valid. The prohibition by the Church of Scotland of Baptism by others than ordained Ministers may be considered disciplinary rather than a doctrinal requirement, and to be intended to emphasize the fact of this irregularity.[5] Baptism is no less a Sacrament than Holy Communion, and neither should be administered except by those duly sent by Christ and duly ordained to be ministers of the Word and Sacraments. The general judgement of the Church Universal, however, is that Baptism is to be acknowledged if administered by any baptized person, with water, in the Name and Faith of the Holy Trinity. Baptism cannot be repeated: repetition of the form is not Baptism,

[1] *Directory for Public Worship*, 'Of Baptism', par. 3.
[2] Sprott, *Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland*, p. 62.
[3] Matt. xxviii. 19 (R.V.).
[4] *Conf. of Faith*, xxvii, 4; xxviii, 2; *Directory*, 'Of Baptism', par. 1.
[5] Baptism in the early church was only by 'Bishops' and the Church of Scotland has retained this through its ministers—each a 'Bishop' in his own parish.

but sacrilege.[1] In case of uncertainty whether Baptism has or has not been administered, or of uncertainty whether a rite administered was Baptism, conditional Baptism ought, we may judge, to be sought and given.

Immersion of the person in Baptism is not necessary,[2] but only 'washing with water'. The Greek word for Baptism does not necessarily imply immersion, while in the Greek literature of Judaism it usually refers, when used religiously, to sprinkling.[3] In northern climates, and in the case of infants, all Baptisms are practically 'clinical', i.e. they are such that precautions have to be taken for considerations of health.

Baptism is 'not to be administered in private places or privately, but in the place of public worship',[4] though exception can be made to this in cases of sickness, &c. Baptism is 'not unnecessarily to be delayed'.[5]

SEQUEL OF BAPTISM

In the case of persons baptized in infancy an important stage occurs when, having been instructed in religion and having reached years of responsibility, they advance to full communion with the Church. To do so they must profess their Baptism, own its obligations, and claim its privileges; and their claim must be admitted and they be confirmed in it by the Church. Hitherto they have been in pupilage: heirs of the Kingdom in right of the new birth, but not yet in possession of its fulness. 'The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant.'[6] A time, however, comes when the heir is spiritually of age, and may demand to receive his inheritance. He knows what Baptism

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. Because Baptism is the Sacrament of the once-and-for-all death and resurrection of Christ, to repeat it is to signify the crucifixion of the Son of God afresh and to put Him to an open shame (Heb. vi. 4–6). Because Baptism is solemnly administered in the Name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, to reiterate it is to call in question the authority and to doubt the promise of the Trinity in the first administration.

[2] *Conf. of Faith*, xxviii. 3.

[3] Christian baptism was not a rite of ceremonial cleansing by ablution but a rite signifying cleansing through the Blood of Christ. In Judaism cleansing by the blood of sacrifice was always by sprinkling, a fact which helped to determine Christian practice. The earliest Christian evidence suggests that Baptism usually involved both a descent into water up to the ankles or knees and pouring of water upon the head of the person baptized. Threefold pouring of water was frequently practised in the Early Church, sometimes in indication of the Trinity, and sometimes in indication of burial, instead of the threehandfuls of earth used at the actual interment of a body in the grave.

[4] *Directory*, 'Of Baptism', par. 2. [5] Ibid., par. 1. [6] Gal. iv. 1.

involves, and the vows of it: he believes what the Church believes; and he consents to be separate from what Christ forbids, and to bear his part in the Church's labours and sorrows and sacrifices; and he asks his place in its active ranks. The Church must inquire of him—that he is indeed baptized, and that in faith and life and purpose he is faithful, and, being satisfied of these things must own him and his right, and must serve him heir, and open to him the way into the Holiest. It is due and right that the Church should do this with formal emphasis—with benediction and prayer, and invocation of the Holy Ghost to add His gifts where He has given and has nourished life.

The fact that no form or direction for this action is contained in the *Westminster Directory* is due to the opposition which Presbyterians and the Scottish delegates had to encounter in the Westminster Assembly from the Puritan and Erastian elements there. 'A paragraph on the subject was prepared, which it was proposed to introduce as a rubric before the form for the administration of the Lord's Supper', but this, 'if adopted by the Assembly, was rejected by the House of Commons'.[1]

The legislation of the Church has, however, constantly recognized and provided for this stage in the growth and life of her children. The First Book of Discipline, for example, says—'None are to be admitted to this mystery [i.e. the Holy Communion] who cannot formally say the Lord's Prayer, the Articles of the Belief [i.e. the Apostles' Creed], nor declare the sum of the Law.' In the period which followed the Reformation 'candidates were carefully instructed, and their admission no doubt took place in church at the public examination of the Congregation before Communion, which was long universal'.[2] In 1706 the Assembly desires Ministers to take 'as strict a trial as can be of such as they admit to the Lord's Supper, and that they diligently instruct them . . . and charge upon their consciences the obligation they lie under from their baptismal covenant, and seriously exhort them to renew the same'.

Baptism is a complete Sacrament: on God's side it ensures to the baptized 'all things that pertain to life and godliness'. But it calls for our response—'a covenant is not of one'; on our side we

[1] Sprott, op. cit., p. 86.

[2] Sprott, op. cit., p. 84, and W. D. Maxwell, *A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland*, p. 91.

must own and embrace its gift and obligation. While this is true in all cases, it is of course the more obviously necessary where Baptism has been received in infancy. The engagement constituted by Baptism then requires to be fulfilled, on the part of the baptized, by conscious acceptance of its status; and, on the part of the Church, by such examination and preparation as are referred to above, and that formal act by which full consequence is given to the earlier act of their admission into His flock. At this stage of the Christian life we should not only look forward to the Lord's Table and all that participation therein implies, but should first and foremost look back to Baptism, and desire to perfect what concerns that, by the open confession of Christ before God and man, and by securing from the Church recognition and confirmation in the place which Baptism bestows. When the Baptismal status is thus acknowledged the way is open to the Holy Table, and to all Christian privilege. It is therefore *Baptism*—the completion on our side of Baptismal relations, the authorization by the Church of our access to full Baptismal inheritance, and the strengthening of the baptized through invocation of the Holy Spirit—which ought at this point to be primarily before the soul's gaze.

As, then, any baptized person approaches the age of responsibility (nature itself marks the transition and indicates the fitting stage of growth), attention should be directed to this step in our vocation. Parents, Sponsors, Teachers, the Ministry, should speak of it, should direct instruction towards it, should move the young soul to a desire to take it. There should be affectionate invitation. There should be personal encouragement. Everything for the soul's growth in the grace and knowledge of Christ depends upon its obedience at this stage of experience. It is a moment of decision. It is the opportunity consciously and personally to embrace the Service of Christ and to commit oneself to His keeping; the occasion upon which conversion may become definite, and faith become aware of itself, and an eternal bond of love to Christ be finally established. When candidates have offered themselves, they should receive the most loving welcome, and they should enter on a most careful preparation, both of the mind and of the heart, but especially of the heart, leading them to a final examination of their intention, purpose and readiness, and so to the moment when before God and the Church they may own

and renew the vows once made on their behalf:[1] when in solemn prayer the Holy Ghost shall be invoked to establish and endow them for new needs and for new service, and hands of blessing shall be laid upon them, and they shall know themselves received to the place which Christ has prepared for them.

FORM OF CONFIRMATION

It is unlikely that there is any direct connexion between the rite known in the Church as 'Confirmation' and the laying on of the hands of the Apostles, of which two instances are recorded.[2] There is no evidence that this was done except by Apostles, and no evidence that it was done by them generally, or for all who were baptized by others.[3] As used in the Acts of the Apostles the laying on of hands seems to have been intended as 'a sign of association in the apostolic or missionary task of the Church'. There may have been a rite of laying on of hands of quite a different nature 'done by way of benediction', used in the general ministry.[4] This was the view of Calvin, which has been so influential in many Reformed Churches. His clearest account is given in his Commentary on Heb. vi. 2:

With Baptisms the Apostle connects the *laying on of hands*, for as there were two sorts of catechumens, so there were two rites. There were heathen who did not come to Baptism until they made a profession of their faith. In regard to these, catechizing preceded Baptism. But the children of the faithful, as they were adopted from the womb, belonged to the Body of the Church by the right of promise, and were baptized in infancy; but after the time of infancy, when they were instructed in the faith, they presented themselves as catechumens. In their case this took place after Baptism. But another symbol was then added: the laying on of hands.

This one passage abundantly testifies that this rite had its beginning from the Apostles, which afterwards, however, was turned into

[1] *Book of Common Order*, 1940, 'Order for the Confirmation of Baptized Persons'. 'You have now come to acknowledge before God and His Church the covenant then made on your behalf.'

[2] Acts viii. 14–25, xix. 1–6. 'It is when Acts comes to be read outside its missionary context by late second-century writers who try to relate it to the changed circumstances of their own day that its account of the laying on of hands is misinterpreted as a description of confirmation' (G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, p. 79). This is similar to the view of Calvin, *Institutes* IV. xix. 6.

[3] G. W. H. Lampe, op. cit., p. 76.

[4] The reference to a doctrine of 'laying on of hands' as among first principles (Heb. vi. 2) may have referred to this.

superstition. They contrived the fiction that it is a sacrament by which the Spirit of regeneration is conferred—a dogma by which they have mutilated Baptism, for what was peculiar to it they transferred to the imposition of hands. Let us know then, that it was instituted by its first founders that it might be an appointed rite for prayer, as Augustine calls it. The profession of faith which youth made, having passed the time of childhood, they intended to confirm by this symbol, but they thought nothing less than to destroy the efficacy of Baptism. Wherefore the pure institution at this day ought to be retained, but the superstition ought to be removed.

This being so, there is nothing to prove a reservation of administration of the rite to Apostles, or to separate it from the ordinary ministry. The *Didache*[1] gives rules for Baptism, but has no reference to any further rite. Justin Martyr (*c.* A.D. 100–165) gives an account of the Sacraments in which the baptized pass directly from the font to participation at the Lord's table. It does not follow that in the second century hands were not laid on the baptized; but it certainly does follow that no such importance was attached to the action as must have been attached to it had it been a fixed institution received from Apostles as a condition of the enjoyment of Baptismal privilege. Tertullian[2] certainly speaks of laying of hands on the baptized as practised in the post-Apostolic Church; he describes Immersion, followed by Unction—'next to this the hand is laid upon us, inviting and invoking the Holy Spirit through the blessing'. It is not a separate Ordinance which he describes, but part of the ritual of Baptism. Unction has appeared in that ritual, and nothing appears to show that the laying on of hands has not been introduced in the same way as unction, or to show that it is a continuation from the Apostolic age.

It is in *The Apostolic Tradition* (*c.* A.D. 215–217)[3] of Hippolytus that we find a further account of the laying on of hands associated with Baptism. The rite of laying on of hands as a benediction on catechumens was used before Baptism. Hands are again laid on during the act of Baptism by the baptizing Presbyter, and then by the Bishop, who prays: 'O Lord God, who didst count these worthy of the forgiveness of sins through the laver of regeneration of the Holy Spirit, send upon them Thy grace, that they may

[1] *Didache*, vii.

[2] *De Baptismo*, 7, 8. In *De Corona Militis*, Tertullian makes no mention of unction or of laying on of hands in his account of Baptism.

[3] *The Apostolic Tradition*, §§ 17–23.

serve Thee according to Thy will; to Thee be the glory, to the Father, and to the Son, with the Holy Spirit in the Holy Church, both now and world without end. Amen.' Here we have in Hippolytus a considered embellishment of the rite of Baptism by numerous additional ceremonies, but the laying on of hands and anointing with oil were essentially part of the one indivisible rite of Baptism. It was only in the Gnostic sects that spirit-baptism came to be distinguished from water-baptism, but it was the influence of this heretical notion upon the further development of such a rite as is described by Hippolytus which seems to have led to the later separation of Confirmation as a distinct rite in addition to Baptism,[1] and indeed as its 'perfection' or 'completion'.[2]

Cyprian, about the middle of the third century, suggests that this laying on of hands is based on the Apostolic example—and he speaks of the 'necessity' of unction as well, which certainly had no such basis. There can be no doubt that from Cyprian's time onwards the laying on of hands and unction (or chrism) came to be more generally associated with the ritual of Baptism, and were administered immediately after the 'washing with water', both to adults and to infants. Of the two things the greater stress was laid on the unction. Unction survived when the laying on of hands dropped into abeyance.[3] In the whole Eastern Church unction is administered to the infant upon its Baptism, and there is no laying on of hands nor any subsequent confirmation of Baptism. In the Western Church the laying on of hands fell into the background as compared with unction:[4] the administration came gradually to be reserved to the Bishop, and in consequence came to be separated from Baptism—being delayed until the Bishop could be

[1] See the full and detailed discussion of G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*, pp. 149ff., 223ff., 297ff.

[2] This idea seems to have arisen through a misunderstanding in the West of *perficere, perfectio* as translations of *teleioun, teleiōsis*, terms which derived from the LXX where they were employed to denote *consecration* to holy office or use. This sense is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, ii. 10, v. 9, vii. 11, 19, 28, ix. 9, x. 1, 14, &c., and came to be applied to Baptism in the second century, and later to Ordination.

[3] With Augustine, for example, confirmation seems to play very little if any part at all, being mentioned possibly once in all his writings.

[4] The laying on of hands was used in the West as a means of accepting into the Catholic Church those 'validly' baptized out of it, and of 'perfecting' the Baptism of those who had been baptized in necessity by laymen either as infants or adults (Council of Elvira, can. 38, A.D. 306). In the East, heretics coming over into the Catholic Church were often re-baptized on the ground that heretical Baptism was not true and faithful Baptism in the name of the Trinity.

present—and finally came to be connected with the attainment of 'years of discretion' or at least of understanding. 'In later times the unction came to be regarded as the distinctive outward sign in confirmation, the imposition of hands being merely an elevation of the Bishop's hands in an attitude of prayer and benediction over the candidates kneeling before him.'[1] In the West it was given as soon as possible after Baptism up to the thirteenth century, when it began definitely to acquire the status of a separate sacrament. According to Alexander of Hales, confirmation was first instituted as a sacrament in A.D. 845 at the Council of Meaux,[2] but this development was only finalized in the Roman Church at the Council of Trent.[3] In the modern Roman use Confirmation is administered not earlier than the seventh year of age and generally five or six years later. It is not an admission to full communion—first communion precedes it, and greatly lessens its importance. It is essentially a confirmation with unction, although now the direction to lay the right hand upon the head of candidates has been prescribed. In the Church of England unction was abandoned at the Reformation and the laying on of hands revived.

There can be little doubt that the introduction of confirmation, and, long before it, of penance, as separate sacraments not only indicated the weakness of the doctrine and practice of Baptism in the West, but had the effect of depreciating Baptism, for in order to make it into a sacrament the proper promises had to be severed from Baptism and applied to it. Thus all believing were said to become 'complete Christians' after Baptism by receiving the Holy Spirit through the laying on of hands. This invention Calvin called both an 'insult' and an 'injury' to Baptism.[4]

In the Church of England at the Reformation the notion of Confirmation as a Sacrament 'completing Baptism' was abandoned along with unction, although the rite of laying on of hands was retained and even revived. Most of the Elizabethan and Caroline divines agreed with Calvin that, regarded as a Sacrament, this was an 'injury' to Baptism, but frequently cited Calvin in support of the view that Confirmation as an act of blessing and dedication, with invocation after Spirit, should not be neglected.[5] Although some Anglicans in modern times have tried to revive Confirmation

[1] Bishop A. C. A. Hall, *Confirmation* (Longmans, 1902), p. 31.
[2] *Summ.* iv. q. 24. 1. [3] *Sess.* VII. [4] *Inst.* IV. xix. 6, 7.
[5] See, for example, the *Works* of Joseph Hall, Vol. x, pp. 442ff.

as the second half of Baptism, completing it by the sacramental bestowal of the Holy Spirit, this has never been and is not the official teaching of the Church of England.[1]

It is clear, then, that no one Catholic doctrine or practice in the matter exists. The Anglican Archbishops very well summed up the position (*Letter to Leo XIII*, 1877), when they wrote:

> The matter of Confirmation [i.e. whether imposition of hands or chrism] is not entirely certain, and we at any rate do not think that Christians who have different opinions on the subject should be condemned by one another. . . . The Roman Church for many centuries has substituted a stretching out of hands over a crowd of children, or simply over those who are to be confirmed, in the place of laying on of hands on each individual. The Orientals (with Eugenius) teach that the matter is chrism, and use no laying on of hands in this rite. If therefore the doctrine about a fixed matter and form in the Sacraments were to be admitted, the Romans have ministered Confirmation imperfectly for many generations, and the Greeks have none. It is clear that we cannot insist very strictly on that doctrine about a fixed form and matter: inasmuch as all Sacraments of the Church, except Baptism, would in that way be rendered uncertain.

It is difficult even on these principles to see what defect can be alleged against our Scottish practice of Benediction. It has not unction, but neither has the Anglican use. It has not imposition of hands in contact, but neither has the East, nor till lately the unreformed West. It has the essential fact of Baptism solemnly and ceremonially confirmed, which is the only thing that other uses have in common. 'We at any rate do not think that Christians who have different opinions on the subject should be condemned by one another.'[2]

As to the proper Minister of this Act: the later Western use reserved its administration to the Bishop, and this reservation continues in Roman and Anglican practice. It cannot, however, be contended that the reservation is primitive, or that it is universal, or other than locally customary. Over the whole East the presbyter

[1] See the discussion of this by A. E. J. Rawlinson, *Problems of Reunion*, pp. 108ff.; and by G. W. H. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit*. See H. J. Wotherspoon: *Religious Values in the Sacraments*—Croall Lectures, 1926–27. The Special Report of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland in 1950 anent the Preparation of Candidates for Communion says, 'The Committee stresses the importance of the service for the Confirmation of Baptized Persons'.

[2] *Responsio*: English translation, p. 17. This means that the Church of England cannot consistently press the issue of episcopal confirmation in ecumenical relations with other Churches.

who baptizes also 'confirms' (if Unction be the analogue of Confirmation). Ambrose[1] records that in Egypt the presbyters 'sealed' if the Bishops were not present. Jerome[2] says of his fellow-presbyters: 'It becomes us to preach: it is useful that we bless: it is fitting that we confirm.' Gregory gave dispensation to the presbyters of Sardinia 'to anoint the baptized'. Wordsworth shows that 'Presbyterial confirmation was in use . . . in Gaul'[3] (*c.* A.D. 500) and says that it was very common and indeed general in the West, wherever Bishops were few.[4] The Church of Scotland has not left Catholic order in reclaiming to presbyters that they shall 'confirm' those to whom they have administered Baptism.[5] We may say of her practice what an eminent Anglican writer has said of Anglican practice: 'We are . . . in at least as good a position' with 'regard to this ordinance as some other ancient Churches'.[6] What we administer is effectually and substantially *confirmation*—and by common consent confirmation ought not be to iterated.[7]

NOTE ON THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS

The Scriptural defence of the Church's practice of Infant Baptism may be stated under such heads as the following:[8]

1. 'Verily I say unto you, except ye turn, and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of Heaven' (Matt. xviii. 3, R.V.). In face of our Lord's consistent representation of childhood as the type of character required in candidates for the Kingdom of Heaven, it is impossible to contend that childhood has not capacity for spiritual gifts, especially as their 'capacity' is to be judged not so much from the side of the receiver as from the side of the divine Giver, their Creator and Redeemer.

2. 'When Jesus saw it He was moved with indignation' (Mark x. 14, R.V.). The stern rebuke administered by our Lord to the

[1] *On Ephes.*, iv. [2] *Ep. ad Rusticum.*
[3] J. Wordsworth, *The Ministry of Grace* (1901), p. 59. [4] Ibid., p. 82n.
[5] J. M. Neale instances Confirmation as an act which a particular Church might give her Presbyters power to do, as being 'implicitly contained in their office, but not explicitly allowed by the general voice of the Church' (*Letters*, p. 144).
[6] A. J. Mason, *Faith of the Gospel*, p. 302.
[7] *Book of Common Order*, 1940: 'Confirmation and Admission to the Lord's Supper': 'Then, the congregation meanwhile standing, the Minister (raising his hand in blessing over the candidates or laying his hand on the head of each as they kneel before him) shall say: "The God of Grace who has called you to His eternal Glory, confirm you to the end. . . ." '
[8] See *The Biblical Doctrine of Baptism* (Edinburgh, 1958), ch. iv.

disciples, who would have prevented children (infants)[1] being brought to Him for blessing, seems to illustrate the attitude of His mind towards any practice which proceeds upon the assumption of the spiritual incapacity of children.

3. He 'took them in His arms and blessed them, laying His hands upon them' (Mark. x. 16, R.V.) Was this only a form? Was Christ's blessing ineffectual because these were mere infants?

4. 'Make disciples of all the nations, (1) baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; (2) teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you' (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, R.V.) This form of words, in which Baptism was instituted, implies the universal scope of the Sacrament irrespective of nationality or age. The order of the clauses, moreover, which posits the discipline of teaching as for the most part subsequent to Baptism, seems to contemplate a state of Church life in which Infant Baptism is normal, not exceptional.

5. 'Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ. . . . For to you is the promise, *and to your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto Him' (Acts ii. 38, 39, R.V.).[2] Why did St. Peter, in urging the promise as a reason for seeking Baptism, deliberately specify its reference to the children of those who believed, unless either (1) the children themselves were fit subjects of Baptism, or (2) the faith of their parents conferred upon them that qualification, or (3) both of these conditions obtained?[3]

6. The absence of any prohibition of the practice of Infant Baptism implies the positive propriety of that practice. Unless such a prohibition had been pronounced expressly, their belief in the covenant relation, which included children, and their conception of the Family as *one* in the eyes of God—both founded upon Divine ordinance—would leave those who heard St. Peter no alternative but to seek Baptism for their children as well as for

[1] *καὶ τὰ βρέφη*, Luke xviii. 15.

[2] *Book of Common Order*, 1940: 'Order for the Adminstration of the Sacrament of Baptism of infants' . . . : 'Though little children do not understand these things yet is the promise also to them. They are the heirs of the Covenant of Grace; and in holy Baptism God brings them into the family and household of faith, and makes them members of Christ, and citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven.'

[3] They were not to be baptized on the ground of the faith of their parents but on the ground of the divine promise and of the faithfulness of Christ. It is Christ and not another who can stand in for them, for He alone is the faithful 'Amen' of man to God. See *The Biblical Doctrine of Baptism*, pp. 60f.

themselves. The same considerations are equally valid now. The covenant is an everlasting covenant, the family the perpetual unit of society.

7. 'She [Lydia] was baptized *and her household*' (Acts xvi. 15); the Philippian jailer 'was baptized, *he and all his* immediately' (Acts xvi. 33, R.V.); 'I baptized also *the household* of Stephanas' (1 Cor. i. 16). It is possible, of course, that there were no children in any of these three households; but the probability is that there were children—a probability which becomes still greater in view of the fact that the Roman *familia* comprised slaves and their dependants.

8. In two of St. Paul's Epistles—that 'to the saints which are at Ephesus and to the faithful in Christ Jesus', and that 'to the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse'—in passages which deal directly with the several duties of various classes of the baptized—children are included in the exhortation, and are specifically addressed as 'in the Lord' (Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20).

9. Those who deny the legitimacy of Infant Baptism appear to place themselves in this dilemma, that either children are excluded from the Covenant of Grace, or, although included in it, are having the seal of the Covenant withheld from them.

10. If children be withdrawn from the Kingdom of the covenanted Grace of God, the scope of the Redemption, which surely has every stage of human life in view, is unwarrantably restricted. 'Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized?'[1]

THE LORD'S SUPPER

'Our Lord, in the night in which He was betrayed, instituted the Sacrament of His Body and Blood.'[2]

In the outward part of this Sacrament Bread and Wine are laid upon the Table, which St. Paul calls 'The Lord's Table'.[3] These the minister of Christ, after Christ's example, 'takes', and, having 'given thanks', 'sanctifies', 'blesses', and thereby 'sets apart'.[4] He uses sacramental actions: that of the Bread is to take and break it: that of the Cup is to take and to raise it from the Table.[5] He

[1] See Oscar Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, pp. 71ff.

[2] *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 1. [3] 1 Cor. x. 16–17.

[4] *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 3; *Directory*, 'Celebration of the Communion', par. 6.

[5] *Paraphrase* xxxv. 4.

uses a sacramental formula to express what in the Sacrament the elements of Bread of Wine, being now consecrated, are: for certainty of authority the words used are the words of the Lord Himself—'This is My Body', 'This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood'. He then gives the Bread to be eaten by the Faithful, saying, 'This is the Body of Christ', and the Cup to be drunk, saying, 'This Cup is the New Testament in the Blood of Christ'.[1]

The spiritual part of the Sacrament is (1) the commemoration of Christ's offering of Himself upon the Cross once for all, and an oblation of all possible praise to God for the same;[2] and (2) the reception and feeding upon Christ crucified, His Body and Blood, followed by thanksgiving.[3]

It will be seen that this Sacrament has two aspects which are inseparable, but distinct. They are inseparable: for the elements may not be consecrated except to be consumed; moreover, the second part cannot be fulfilled without the fulfilment of the first; nor is Christ's Death fully shown unless its purpose in our Salvation is shown by reception of the elements. They are distinct: for the first is our coming to God to show His Son's death; the second is Christ's coming forth to us in God's Name to bless and nourish us. While these two parts of the Sacrament form one indivisible Eucharist, for convenience they are distinguished as the Consecration and the Communion. The Eucharistic Action of the Sacrament corresponds to the descent of the Son of God to unite Himself to us and us to Him in Incarnation and Atonement, and to His ascent in Resurrection and Ascension to the throne of God where He now lives as our Mediator and High-Priest, presenting us in Himself to the Father. In this Sacrament we both are given communion in the Body and Blood of Christ and are lifted up in Him to the face of the Father who has consecrated for us a new and living way into the Holiest of all. The Sacrament is thus at once a supreme act of worship and a supreme means of grace.[4]

(A) *It is a supreme act of worship.* To worship God is to show

[1] *Directory, ut supra,* pars. 10 and 11. *Book of Common Order,* 1940, 'Order for the Celebration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion' —also in *Ordinal and Service Book for use in the Courts of the Church* (Appendix, p. 123).

[2] *Conf. of Faith,* xxix. 2. [3] Ibid., xxix. 7.

[4] See D. M. Baillie, *The Theology of the Sacraments*: IV, *The Real Presence,* and V, *The Eucharistic Offering.*

forth His worthiness of all service, faith, and love. We show this when we show that God *thus* loved the world.[1] To glorify God is to proclaim what God has done. We may do so in word, as when we stand together and say 'I believe', reciting our Creed to His praise; or when we sing of His mighty acts; or when we declare His everlasting Gospel. But there is a point where words are finished and they fail us: then this still remains—the silence in which we obey Christ who said '*Do this*'. When we stretch out between God's judgement and ourselves the witness of Christ, let that speak for us.[2]

In the heavenly places the ascended Saviour, living unto God, presents Himself before the Father on our behalf, showing His Death and pleading His accomplished sacrifice. He is there the 'Lamb as it had been slain',[3] 'a propitiation for us'.[4] In this act we now are one with Him: He is the Head, we are the Body. What He then does personally in the Upper Sanctuary, He echoes in us on earth as we fulfil His command in making this Memorial: uniting us to Himself by His Holy Spirit and ministering also in and through us before God. We are united with Him in His heavenly priesthood, sacramentally enacting here in His Name that which in the actuality is proper only to Himself.[5]

In recognizing this purpose and effect of the Sacrament we are warned by our standards not to lose sight of its commemorative character. 'In this sacrament Christ is not offered up to His

[1] John iii. 16.

[2] This is very well expressed in William Bright's Communion Hymn, *Unde et Memores* (*The Church Hymnary*, 320):

> And now, O Father, mindful of the love
> That bought us, once for all, on Calvary's Tree,
> And having with us Him that pleads above,
> We here present, we here spread forth to Thee
> That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,
> The one true, pure, immortal sacrifice.
>
> Look, Father, look on His anointed face,
> And only look on us as found in Him;
> Look not on our misusings of Thy grace,
> Our prayer so languid, and our faith so dim:
> For lo! between our sins and their reward
> We set the passion of Thy Son our Lord.

[3] Rev. v. 6. [4] Rom. iii. 25.

[5] We are not to think of Christ's Self-Offering as 'perfecting' and 'completing' our imperfect offerings, but that these are displaced by His completed Self-Offering made on our behalf. We can only offer what has already been offered on our behalf, and offer it by the only mode appropriate to such a substitutionary offering, by prayer, praise and thanksgiving.

Father, nor any real sacrifice made at all for remission of sins.[1] There is 'one Sacrifice for sins for ever',[2] the Sacrifice of the Cross, offered 'once for all': the only, the full, the perfect, the sufficient satisfaction. To show this very sufficiency is of the essence of what we do. This it is which we plead: that Christ has died, and that His death prevails and has put away sin. There is a pleading; but there is no repetition, no continuing, of Christ's 'sacrifice for sins': nothing added to that of which we are appointed to testify before God that it is finished and is now eternally prevalent.[3] The Cross is central to faith; and it stands alone. All the ritual of the Old Testament anticipated the Cross, pointing forward to it: all the worship of the New Testament commemorates the Cross, pointing back to it. Christ has still 'somewhat to offer': to have that somewhat belongs to the very nature of His Priesthood; but His Sacrifice is now a 'living sacrifice': it is Himself as alive from the dead that He offers to the Father on our behalf: and in the Sacrament He unites us with Himself in the action of His self-presentation.

And as the Eucharist is thus '*the oblation of all possible praise*', it is also the profoundest *confession of sin*. A true confession on our part can only be an echo and response to the obedient life and death of Christ who both confessed our sin before God and confessed the righteous judgement of God on our sin. As such He is the High Priest of our confession, our faithful 'Amen' to the Father's judgement inflicted on Him for our sakes, and the merciful 'Amen' of the Father accepting us in Christ on the ground of His sacrifice.[4] It is therefore in Christ's name alone that we make confession of sin—because we thus show the cost of mercy, and show at what price we are redeemed, and testify that unless Christ had died for us, we had without doubt perished everlastingly.

It is further the utmost *act of prayer*. The appeal to God which faith continually makes in every supplication—'for Jesus' sake'—

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 2. [2] Heb. x. 12.

[3] We come to God with empty hands. 'Nothing in my hands I bring; simply to Thy Cross I cling.' At the Holy Supper our hands are filled by the Lord with the bread and wine, the pledges of His unique sacrifice, and so we approach the Father sheltering only in the Name and Sacrifice of our Mediator and Saviour. 'For He alone (saith Ambrose) is our mouth, by whom we speak to God; He is our eyes, by whom we see God, and also our right hand, by whom we offer anything unto the Father.' (John Knox, *A Declaration of the True Nature of Prayer*, *Works*, III, p. 97).

[4] cf. J. McLeod Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement*, p. 116.

here takes the form of action.[1] We say, 'Know Thou whether this be Thy Son's Body broken, Thy Son's Blood that was shed, for us.' We say, 'Know Thou whether we be not those sinners for whom Christ died'; into our hands He has put these things, and to us He has said, 'Do This'. We plead His Atonement: as it is written, 'Put me in remembrance; let us plead together'.[2]

And we are called to watch and pray with Christ in his INTERCESSION. Our association with Christ in His prayer is clearly set forth in that He puts His own prayer 'Our Father who art in Heaven' into our mouth.[3] That is His atoning prayer in which He identifies Himself with us in our need before God, and identifies us as brothers with Him, the Son of the Father. But because our Lord's atoning prayer was His whole life of Obedience and praise to the Father, as well as His intercessory death on the Cross, He now, risen from the dead, ever lives to make intercession for us. For Christ intercedes 'by His appearing in our nature continually before the Father in Heaven in the merit of His obedience and sacrifice';[4] and in these aspects accordingly of His Person and work we make Memorial of Him in the Sacrament when we DO THIS. It is thought appropriate that in the midst of 'doing this' the 'Our Father who art in heaven' has its essential place.

The Eucharist therefore embodies every part of Worship, and is itself the specific worship which Christ has ordained.

(B) This Sacrament is further *a supreme means of grace*. In it our Saviour appears as the Mediator *for us with God*, bringing us with Himself and causing us to take part with Him in His Heavenly Ministry. But in it our Saviour also appears as the Mediator of the mercies *of God to us*. Through Him the great confession and the great appeal have been made; and now through Him comes the answer. He takes from the Table the consecrated

[1] Our Lord's high-priestly prayer (John xvii) belongs to the wholeness of the Supper, and represents His Self-oblation to the Father behind the veil of the outward dramatic action which represents His Self-giving to men. Correspondingly the celebration of the Supper in the Church is to be regarded as the dramatic counterpart on earth which we are commanded to do in His Name as He, our Advocate and Priest, intercedes for us in Heaven on the ground of His unique sacrifice. Through the Spirit who helps our infirmities that heavenly intercession is made to echo ineffably in our Eucharistic intercessions on earth.

[2] Isa. xliii. 26.

[3] See Calvin's *Sermon on Isaiah*, liii. 12: 'He poured out His soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet He bare the sin of many and made intercession for the transgressors.'

[4] *Larger Catechism*, 55.

Things, which He has named His Body and Blood,[1] and, giving them to us, makes us partakers of them, so to feed upon Him that He may be one with us and we with Him, that He may live in us and we in Him.[2] 'For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all of one; for which cause He is not ashamed to call them brethren.'[3] That this might be fulfilled Jesus prayed at the Last Supper in His great high-priestly prayer: 'For their sakes I sanctify myself, that they themselves also may be sanctified in truth . . . that they may be one even as we are one, I in them and they in me, that they may be consecrated in one.'[4]

The Church of Scotland teaches that, receiving the Consecrated Elements, we receive Christ's Body and Blood.[5] In the Sacrament and for its purpose, they are what He has declared them to be. 'Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible Elements in this Sacrament do then also inwardly by Faith, really and indeed, yet not corporally or carnally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified and all benefits of His Death: The Body and Blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the Bread and Wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the Elements themselves are to their outward senses.'[6]

[1] We are to 'eat of *that* Bread' and to 'drink of *that* Cup'. 'That Bread' and 'that Cup' are the Bread and Cup which have been 'taken' and 'blessed' in the sacramental actions of the Holy Table. The use of any other is not 'Communion with the Table of the Lord' (1 Cor. x. 21).

[2] *Directory*, 'Celebration of the Communion', par. 8.c. *Book of Common Order*, 1940: 'that the bread which we break may be the Communion of the body of Christ; and the cup of blessing which we bless the Communion of the blood of Christ; that we receiving them, may by faith be made partakers of His body and blood, with all His benefits . . . to the glory of Thy most holy name'.

[3] Heb. ii. 11. [4] John xvii. 19, 23.

[5] See Calvin's *Geneva Catechism*, op. cit., pp. 59f., 62; *The Heidelberg Catechism*, pp. 83f.; *Craig's Catechism*, 1581, pp. 154ff.; *The New Catechism*, p. 181.

[6] *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 7. In this the *Westminster Confession* repeats the teaching of the *Scots Confession* of 1560: 'The union and conjunction which we have with the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus in the right use of the Sacraments, wrought by the Holy Ghost, who by true faith carryeth us above all things that are visible, carnall, or earthly, and maketh us to feed upon the Body and Blood of Christ Jesus, which was once broken and shed for us, which is now in Heaven and appeareth in the presence of His Father for us, and yet notwithstanding the far distance of place. . . . we must certainly believe that the Bread which we break is the Communion of Christ's Body, and the Cup which we bless is the Communion of His blood. So that we confess and undoubtedly believe that the Faithful in the right use of the Lord's Table do so eat the Body and drink the Blood of the Lord Jesus that He remaineth in them and they in Him: Yea, they are so made flesh of His flesh and bone of His bone that as the Eternall Godhead hath given to the flesh of Jesus . . . life and immortality: so doth Christ Jesus

The Church of Scotland thus asserts the presence of the Heavenly part of the Sacrament, as well as of the Earthly part or sign: but refuses to explain the manner of that presence.[1] It is not a physical presence ('carnally or corporally'): it is Spiritual—that is to say, it is by the agency of the Holy Spirit.[2] The Body and Blood are 'really present' because spiritually present; and they are really received by communicants who fulfil the normal conditions of the Sacrament, coming to it in spirit as well as in body. The explanation of the sacramental presence which is offered by the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation ('a change of the substance of Bread and Wine into the substance of Christ's Body and Blood') is definitely set aside as 'overthrowing the nature of the Sacrament'.[3] The 'nature of a Sacrament' is to 'have two parts', an earthly as well as a heavenly.[4] The doctrine of Transubstantiation denies the reality of the earthly part, and, instead of a mystery of Divine grace, leaves only a miracle of Divine power. Consequently the Church of Scotland rejects the extreme inferences which the Church of Rome draws from its doctrine. Our Lord has said of the Consecrated Elements, 'This is My Body', 'This is My Blood'. He has not said of them, 'This Bread, this Wine, is Me'. We believe and teach the truth of what Christ has said. On the same ground (that 'a sacrament has two

[1] It can no more be explained than the union of the divine and human natures in Christ, which Catholic theology sets forth only in the great Chalcedonian negatives (*inconfuse, immutabiliter, indivise, inseparabiliter*) in order to guard it against error from all sides. It is in that inexpressible 'mystery of Christ' that we are given to have communion in the Lord's Supper.

[2] For a full and clear exposition of this see Robert Bruce's first sermon on the Lord's Supper, *The Mystery of the Lord's Supper*, pp. 69ff. We must beware of the looseness of thought which makes 'spiritual' an equivalent for 'imaginary', 'metaphorical', or 'figurative'. A 'spiritual gift' is not an imaginary gift; it is a gift of the Holy Spirit. A spiritual person is not an imaginary person, but a person filled with the Holy Ghost. Christ's Body is now spiritual, but it is still His Body. Spiritual presence is not real absence. The spiritual is the real. Faith is not fancy. In the heavenly and eternal sphere which is the background of reality underlying appearances, the sphere of which by our Communion of the Holy Ghost we are inhabitants, the Body and Blood of Christ are present to us, and are given to us. The gift is by the power of God, and takes place objectively and independently of us—as Christ is given for the life of the world, whether the world receive Him or no. *Reception* of the gift is by faith—the spiritual in us meeting and grasping the spiritual content of the Sacrament.

[3] *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 6. Again see R. Bruce, op. cit., pp. 97ff.

[4] *Larger Catechism*, 163.

His flesh and blood eaten and drunk by us give unto us the same prerogative.' God's power takes up the earthly, both the elements of the Sacrament and also ourselves, into the heavenly, where all is real, though nothing is explicable to our senses, and there fulfils His Word on which we trust.

parts') the Church of Scotland equally rejects the doctrine that the elements only symbolize the Body and Blood of Christ. This doctrine denies the reality of the heavenly part of the Sacrament, as the doctrine of Rome denies the earthly, and so is against the nature of a Sacrament, which 'has two parts'.[1] It reduces the Sacrament to be no more than ritual, and would take us back from the spiritual realities of the Gospel Dispensation to the mere symbolism of the Mosaic Dispensation. It is emphatically renounced by the *Scots Confession* of 1560 (ch. xxii: 'We utterly damne the vanitie of them that affirme the Sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signes') as well as by the *Confession of Faith*. And it is contrary to the testimony of the Spirit in the Church of God generally.

St. Paul (1 Cor. xi. 23–29) has stated what is essential in word and action to a valid celebration of the Sacrament. The due fulfilment of the Institution requires (*a*) the use of the instituted Elements; (*b*) the use of the instituted Words; (*c*) the use of the instituted Actions.[2] What fulfils these conditions is, so far as such conditions are concerned, valid. But for reverence and edification something more than this barely valid minimum is requisite—St. Paul himself appears to refer to this, which is to

[1] The mystery of the sacramental union between the sign and the thing signified reflects the mystery of Christ, i.e. the union of divine and human natures in His one person, without confusion and without separation. Correspondingly, in the sacramental union, while the sign and the signified reality are to be distinguished they are not to be separated, and while they are to be united they are not to be confounded, that is, converted or transubstantiated into one another. Thus behind both the extremes repudiated by the Church of Scotland lie the deep Christological errors which confound or separate the divine and human natures of Christ. It was on this basis of the doctrine of Christ that Calvin defended the Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper—see, for example, *The True Partaking of the Flesh and Blood of Christ* (*Corpus Reformatorum* 37, p. 473); or *Comm. on 1 Cor.*, x. 3 (*Corpus Reformatorum* 77, p. 454).

[2] It seems to require, also, Thanksgiving as the enveloping character of the whole proceeding, since our Lord's 'giving thanks' was certainly part of the example of which He said, 'This do'. Certain instruments of the Sacrament would also appear to be instituted and unalterable, namely: The Table and the Cup. It is to be noted that Holy Scripture refers only once to the contents of the Cup, 'this fruit of the Vine' (Matt. xxvi. 29); 'the fruit of the Vine' (Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 18), but on all other occasions to the Cup itself. 'He took the Cup' (Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23; Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25); 'This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood' (Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25); 'The Cup of blessing which we bless' (1 Cor. x. 16): 'The Cup of the Lord' (1 Cor. x. 21); 'This Cup', 'The Cup of the Lord', 'The Cup' (1 Cor. xi. 26, 27, 28). The one Cup symbolizes the One Lord, who is Himself the Vessel of eternal Life in whom is presented the Atonement which we commemorate: and it is part of the Institution.

the Sacrament as the setting to a jewel, or seems, at least, to include it, when he speaks of 'the rest'[1] which he will set in order when he comes to Corinth in person. We know of no time when this devotional surrounding to the Sacrament has been wanting. While it has varied locally in details, it has not, since at least the third century, varied much; but has everywhere consisted (*a*) in acts of preparation and approach to the actual Commemoration—psalmody, confession, prayer; the reading of the Scriptural witness to Christ from Prophet, Epistle, and Gospel; the preaching of the Word, the making of offerings, thanksgiving, the recitation of the Passion, invocation of the Holy Spirit, intercession, and the Lord's Prayer; and (*b*) in acts of thanksgiving and prayer and blessing in sequel to the celebration; and this universal usage, which we know so familiarly, has determined the typical forms of Christian worship generally.[2]

In the Apostolic Church the Sacrament was celebrated every Lord's Day, and its celebration was the occasion of the assembling 'into one place'.[3] This is undisputed. The continuance of the usage is testified to by *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*[4] and by Justin Martyr.[5] From the fourth century onward, while the Celebration continued, communion by the people became less frequent. The Lateran Council (A.D. 1215) found it necessary to decree that the faithful should communicate at least once in each year; and this, which was tolerated only as a minimum, tended to become the rule.

The effect of the Reformation was, on the whole, to restore more frequent communicating. The Apostolic practice of weekly celebration was advised and aimed at;[6] while a monthly celebration was generally treated as a minimum. As regards Scotland the document known as the *First Book of Discipline* contemplated only

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 34.

[2] See W. D. Maxwell, *A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland*, pp. 59f.

[3] Acts ii. 42, 46, xx. 7; 1 Cor. xi. 20. [4] *Didache*, xiv.

[5] *First Apology*, 67 (A.D. 155).

[6] Thus, for example, Calvin: 'Most assuredly the custom which prescribes Communion once a year is an invention of the Devil, by what instrumentality soever it may have been introduced . . . it ought to have been far otherwise. Each week at least the Table of the Lord ought to have been spread for the company of Christians' (*Inst.*, VI. xvii. 4). Again, 'The Sacrament might be celebrated in the most becoming manner if it were dispensed to the Church very frequently, at least once a week.' This language is only typical of that of the Reformers generally. See Appendix D, p. 112.

quarterly Communion, but was not followed; and monthly Communion was at all events suggested by the *Book of Common Order*.[1] According to Alexander Henderson frequency of celebration depended partly on local factors. 'The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is more frequently minstered in some Congregations than in others, according to the number of the communicants, and the proficience of the people in the way of Christ; and in some places upon one Sabbath, in other places upon two or three Sabbaths, as it may be done most conveniently, which is determined by the Minister, and Eldership of the Church.'[2] At the time of the Westminster Assembly, Calderwood and others charged the Episcopalian section with the infrequency of their Communion.[3]

The Westminster Directory of Public Worship says that 'the Communion or Supper of the Lord is frequently to be celebrated';[4] and the frequency contemplated is such as ordinarily to supersede the necessity of intimation on a previous Sunday, which would seem to imply the desirability of weekly celebration. Under Puritan influences, which invaded Scotland from England, annual or semi-annual Communions became the rule—and indeed the practice of our Church in this respect has always been below its own standard; but repeated Acts of Assembly have enjoined or pointed to reformation in the matter.[5] The custom now is for most churches to have at least four celebrations a year, and some celebrate monthly.

THE SERVICES OF THE CHURCH

These fall into three classes:

(1) Eucharistic;
(2) Offices of Prayer;
(3) Offices of Benediction.

[1] *Book of Common Order* (Knox's Prayer Book), 'Preface to the manner of the administration of the Lord's Supper': 'The day when the Lord's Supper is ministered, which is commonly used once a month.' This, however, was not followed in practice. (See Sprott, *Introduction to Book of Common Order*, p. xlii and Maxwell, op. cit., pp. 51f.)

[2] *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, 1641, p. 20.

[3] *Holy Communion and Frequency of Celebration*, by John Macleod (Edin., 1887), p. 9. Holy communion is always celebrated weekly at St. Giles' Cathedral.

[4] 'Of the Celebration of the Communion', par. 1.

[5] *Acts of Assembly*, 1701, xxix.; 1711, vi.; 1724, vi.; 1826, v.; 1837, ult.; 1842, iv.

(1) EUCHARISTIC: This has been already considered as the Worship prescribed by our Lord, and as the characteristic Service of the Lord's Day. Its devotional setting has been referred to, as well as the fact that for long ages and in all parts of the Church the constituent elements and the order of this setting have been in general features the same.

The Service has, for purpose of historical discussion, been divided into two parts: that '*of the Catechumens*' and that '*of the Faithful*'. In early times the former was open to all, the latter only to persons in full communion with the Church.

(a) The 'Service of the Catechumens' is essentially directed to instruction; its central feature is *the Word*, read and preached. Originally there were four readings—from the *Law*, the *Prophet*, the *Apostle*, and the *Gospel*. These were regarded as witnesses to Christ, and the Gospel came last, as of final and complete testimony. In the ordinary usage of the West they have generally been reduced to two—the *Epistle* and *Gospel*, but the Celtic Churches retained the Prophecy. The reading of the Word was generally preceded by Psalmody—often by prayers and confessions of sin; and *Hymns of Praise* answered to each Scripture as soon as it was read.[1] Then followed the *Sermon*, the exposition of the Word read, or of some part of it—usually of the Gospel. Certain acts of Intercession generally closed this part of the Service.

(*b*) INTERCESSIONS also opened the Service of the Faithful and were followed by the *offering of gifts* (the modern 'Collection'). Then came various prayers, and latterly (i.e. from the fifth century, in the East) the Creed. All of this was regarded as preparatory to the celebration *proper*: the 'entering into the Holiest through the Veil'. The central action of the Service began with the Call, '*Lift up your hearts*', followed by the Hymn, '*Holy, Holy, Holy*', and by commemorations (1) of God's mighty acts (*a*) in Creation, (*b*) in Providence, (*c*) in Salvation, and (2) of the Institution. Next came the solemn Memorial (the *anamnesis*), the Invocation of the Holy Spirit (the *epiclesis*), and the solemn Intercession. In some usages the sacramental actions[2] are interwoven with these acts of worship, in others they occur later; in one position or the other they of course invariably occur. *The*

[1] In the West, from the period of the great Conciliar definitions of Doctrine, the Creed became the responsory to the Gospel.

[2] Otherwise named the 'manual acts'.

Communion follows: that is, the reception of the Consecrated Elements, connected with the *consecration* by the Lord's Prayer, in close dependence on which there follow prayers for personal preparation.[1] After Communion there is *thanksgiving*, perhaps *exhortation*, some act of *praise*, and a final Blessing.[2]

After the Reformation, when it was no longer permitted to celebrate unless Communion of the people was to follow, it became usual in many parts of the Reformed Church to stop the Service after the offerings were collected. It will be seen how like, even if there be no historical connexion,[3] this arrested Service is to the ordinary Sunday Morning Service to which we are accustomed on those Sundays on which Holy Communion is not celebrated.[4]

(2) OFFICES OF PRAYER: It has always been regarded as an indispensable Christian duty that each one of the Faithful in the privacy of his own life should offer daily prayer. This duty includes at the very least prayer every morning and prayer every evening. But, in addition to such private prayer, as the morning and evening sacrifice were offered in the Temple every day, so from very early times the Church has been accustomed similarly to assemble for common Daily Praise and Prayer every evening and every morning.[5] The characteristic features of these Daily Services have been Psalmody and Prayer, with short Readings of Scripture.

The Reformed Church of Scotland continued this Observance. 'For nearly a century after the Reformation there was daily morning and evening prayer in all the principal churches of the country',[6] at which the *Book of Common Order* was followed. The disuse of this Prayer Book for the Westminster Directory, and the Puritan influence which entered at the same time, led to the cessation of daily services. The Lord's Day alone retained its morning and

[1] St. Gregory the Great is responsible for the remarkable statement that in primitive use the Lord's Prayer was itself the only Consecration. The statement is doubtless mistaken, but may be regarded as evidence of a strong tradition that the Lord's Prayer has from the beginning been immediately associated with the central actions of the Eucharistic Service.

[2] The above is intended only as a summary of the general lines of the typical service. See Appendix.

[3] Brightman, *The English Rite*, ii. 1,039.

[4] See W. Niesel, 'The Order of Public Worship in the Reformed Churches', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 2, 1949, pp. 381ff.

[5] The origin of daily *Common* Prayer is not altogether certain, but the fact of its early and constant practice is.

[6] Sprott, *Worship and Offices*, p. 263.

evening worship; and in many parishes even on the Lord's Day evening service fell into abeyance. 'The public worship of God was thus reduced to a minimum never before reached in any Christian country.'[1] In recent decades evening worship has been restored in most rural parishes (it has always continued in towns and larger villages), while daily services begin again to be observed.

(3) SERVICES OF BENEDICTION: These are in their nature special and occasional. Their chief purpose is the consecration of ourselves to God's service or the ministration of His grace for our need. They may take place independently; or they may be interpolated in the Communion Service or in the abbreviated form of worship which so often occupies the place of the Communion Service.[2]

Ordination, Induction, Admissions to Sacred Office (as of Elder, Deaconess, &c.), Marriage, Confirmation, Reception of Catechumens, Absolutions, Dedications of Churches or of Vessels for Worship, are examples of this species of service. Funeral Services may perhaps be best classified under this heading. Nor should it be forgotten that all true Pastoral Visitation should be a service of Benediction in fulfilment of the Minister's sacred office to bless the people from God.[3]

THE SACRAMENTAL LIFE

As has been said ('Sacrament', p. 17) the two Sacraments cover the field of Christian experience in its two great aspects of Entrance into Christ and of Life in Christ. The Christian soul may therefore constantly see its experience reflected and expressed for it in terms of the Sacraments—it may view itself as the Sacraments show it—and may be assured that if it conforms itself to the meaning of the Sacraments, it is conforming to God's will and purpose for it, and is abiding in the way of its calling.[4]

(1) *Baptism*

Reception of Baptism is the normal starting point of the spiritual

[1] Sprott, *Worship and Offices*, p. 263; Maxwell, op. cit., p. 111.

[2] See above p. 49.

[3] *The Form of Presbyterial Church-Government:* Of Pastors. Orders for such services can be found in the *Book of Common Order 1940, Ordinal and Service Book for use in the Courts of the Church*, 1954, and *Let us Pray*, 1959. John Baillie's *A Diary of Private Prayer* is an invaluable guide for personal devotion and sick visiting, as is *Kyrie Eleison* by H. J. Wotherspoon (Blackwood).

[4] See William Manson, *The Way of the Cross* (Hodder & Stoughton, 1958).

development of the individual soul, and the course of that development exhibits the unfolding of the content of Baptism. This is the view of the Catholic Church, and of the Church of Scotland in its standards. This conception is defined by the Church of Scotland in terms of unusual force and explicitness as the 'improvement of Baptism',[1] which is declared to be 'a duty', and 'to be performed by us all our life long'. This 'improvement' is 'through consideration of its [i.e. Baptism's] nature and ends, of the privileges and benefits conferred thereby, and of its vows'; and by penitence for defect from 'the grace of Baptism' and its 'engagements'. On the basis of Baptism we are to 'grow up to assurance of pardon of sin, and of all other blessings sealed to us in that Sacrament'.

We are to 'draw strength from the death and resurrection of Christ, into whom we are baptized'; to the result 'of the mortifying of sin', and the 'quickening of grace' (of which the presence is assumed, our part being to seek its quickening). As baptized persons we are to 'endeavour to live by faith', and 'to have our conversation in holiness and righteousness. The nurture of the baptized is thus a nurture in the Lord. Its purpose on the Divine side is that the developing self-consciousness of the soul should be, as it were, an awakening in the arms of God—a recognition of God as Father, and of Christ as Saviour, and a recognition of self as child of God and member of Christ. Where Baptism obtains an unhindered fruition, and in the measure in which it does so, life moves from the first within the region of the Spirit, and growth is the growth of the Christian in Christ.

(2) *From the Status of the Baptized to the Status of the Communicant*

(*a*) In normal circumstances, the Christian child will grow up to knowledge of truth as it is in Christ, to habits of Christian morality, and towards the cultivation of Christian graces. In the first stages, however, its relation to these must necessarily be passive rather than active. It receives what is delivered to it; it obeys positive precept. The habit of conduct is imposed upon it, rather than formed by a succession of its own acts of choice. The truths believed are accepted rather than embraced.

(*b*) The good habit and the right belief are not on that account devoid of value. On the contrary, they are of supreme value; for

[1] *Larger Catechism*, 167.

(i) they determine character, and (ii) they prepare the way for that personal adherence to Christ to which all preliminary training is subservient.

(*c*) But the existence of these habits, the knowledge of these truths, however unquestioningly acquiesced in, do not themselves imply the abandonment of self and the submission to our Lord's demands, the acceptance of the righteousness of God, or the surrender of the will to our Lord's right or possession. Such acts as these are necessary, and can hardly be wholly unconscious in any case; they fall into place as a part of the 'improvement of Baptism'.

(*d*) This interior stage is externally represented in the Sacramental Life by the moment at which the baptized person offers himself for the renewal of the Baptismal covenant. He then declares that he understands the promises of Christ extended to him in Baptism, the renunciations, obligations and professions involved, and that he personally appropriates them. Upon the basis of this act of reliance upon the promise of Baptism and of all that has been sealed to him in Baptism, he seeks recognition by the Church of his right to participate in the full inheritance of grace.

If this declaration and this request are made in full reality, they will imply decision for *Christ* and conversion to *God*, because, as declared and sealed in his Baptism, Christ had already laid hold of him and had already given to God an account for him. His decision rests upon the prior decision of Christ made on his behalf, and his conversion is the fruit of his adoption and ingrafting into Christ. Every effort on the part of the pastor and teacher should be concentrated at this stage to obtain that this result may be a definite and conscious act. It is a lamentable thing if the preparation of Catechumens has to consist only of instruction on the doctrine of the Sacraments, for which time past might have sufficed. The preparation appropriate to this stage is spiritual. Its proper aim should be to ascertain, or to produce, decision and conversion: where these exist, to make the soul conscious of their existence; where they have not been reached, to aid the soul to attain to them. The Christian soul, viewing its life sacramentally, will always connect this step with its self-conscious dedication to our Lord. It may do so with happy and thankful remembrance, or it may do so with penitence, because the full intention of the rite was not apprehended at the time. Nevertheless, the spiritual relation of the

succession of ordinance to the stages of the interior life is evident. Sacramentally, this reappropriation of the Baptismal covenant corresponds to interior decision for Christ, and personal conscious response to His grace.

(3) *Communion*

Passing now to the Eucharist, the baptized person finds himself engaged in an action in which his life in Christ and its spiritual secret are fully expressed.[1] The whole Gospel is here. To communicate rightly is to live through the act of saving faith. For example: (*a*) We see in it the separation to Christ of His Flock, and its isolation in Him from the world. We see that it is to Christ that the Church gathers; He sets Himself in the midst and shows us His Hands and His Side. (*b*) We see that the basis of faith is the Incarnation: it is His Body, His Blood, that we are there to receive. We see that Redemption was by redemptive acts: it is His Death that we show. Faith is thus carried back to the days of His flesh, from which faith has its origin. (*c*) It is also carried upwards to the living Presence of Christ, who is at the right hand of God. Holy Communion is the Sacrament not of His Death only, but also of His Resurrection and Ascension, and of the gift of the Holy Ghost (by which alone it is a Sacrament); and it is the Sacrament of the Christ who shall come again. (*d*) The celebration of this Sacrament is the worship of the Father by the Son acting in the Church by the Holy Spirit. Here, therefore, we find ourselves set before the glory of the Eternal Trinity.

(*e*) Further, with regard to ourselves: the celebration is, as already said (p. 41), a supreme act of penitence, in which we confess that had not Christ died we must have perished eternally; and (*f*) a supreme act of faith; for, notwithstanding this confession, we have boldness to enter the Holiest, showing His Death as the ground of our acceptance and claiming in its power the forgiveness of sins. (*g*) The Sacrament further exhibits Christ in His Mediation of Salvation and life. He gives us from His Table—He is at peace with us—we are at peace with Him. Our sins which we have done shall be no more mentioned to us. He absolves. He blesses. He brings us to the Father, accepted in Himself. (*h*) It is shown to us that Christ is Himself the nourishment of our souls. He is the living Bread—as Christ lives by the Father, so he who makes Christ

[1] Compare Heb. x. 19–25.

his food shall live by Christ. (*i*) In acknowledging and showing this, we perceive that we are become ourselves a living sacrifice to God in Christ. He offers us to His Father as He offers Himself, and we yield ourselves to Him, and our members to be His instruments, vowing ourselves to His holiness. And He enables us to do, as well as to will: for 'He gives more grace'.

(*j*) Further, we find that except in fellowship with one another we have received none of these things. Much is implied in the refusal of the Church to celebrate the Sacrament except in the Congregation. What each receives, he gives,[1] so that in watching the act of Communion one seems actually to see the circulation of Life in the Body. And thereby each binds himself to deal with the brother as the Lord has dealt with himself; forgiving trespass, covering sin, laying down life for the brother. (*k*) Further still, Christ is the propitiation not for our sins only but for the sins of the whole world, and should be preached to the whole world. Laying hold of Him for its own need, the soul apprehends its debt to remember the need of the world without, for which also Christ died. We are debtors to the world for much kindness; we should do good to all men as we have opportunity; we should not 'eat our morsel alone'—least of all the Bread of God.

In ways like this we can think our whole life into the form of this Sacrament—for all the truth and all the duty of our relation to Christ, and in Christ to God and man, are implied in it; therefore we can think the Sacrament into our whole life, bearing about with us always the dying of the Lord Jesus, and showing His Death by our own death to sin and life to God. We are in spirit constantly to recognize ourselves as the Sacrament shows us—ministering before the Father and testifying of our Lord.

To live thus (1) in a Baptismal consciousness, as St. Paul describes it (1 Cor. vi. 11: 'But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God'), and in the improvement of Baptism as the Church teaches it, (2) in a Eucharistic consciousness as the Epistle to the Hebrews describes it (Heb. x. 19–25: 'Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He has consecrated for us,

[1] The social doctrine of the Sacrament has, it may be observed, emphatic expression in the practice of the Scottish Church, by which the communicant receives the Consecrated Elements from the hand of his brother communicant.

through the veil, that is to say, His flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water. Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering (for He is faithful that promised); and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together')—that is the Sacramental Life: Life stated to oneself in terms of Christ's own choosing, and life which, so far as it is received and lived in fact, is necessarily a life which abides in Christ.

III

Doctrine, or the Word

HOLY SCRIPTURE

'It pleased the Lord, at sundry times and in divers manners, to reveal Himself and to declare. . . . His will unto His Church; and afterwards, for the better preserving and propagating of the truth, and for the more sure establishment and comfort of the Church . . . to commit the same wholly unto writing; which maketh the Holy Scripture to be most necessary unto salvation.'[1]

The Confession of Faith here recognizes the Holy Scriptures as the written Word of God to men in and through which it is God Himself who speaks in person,[2] but it recognizes also that Revelation was precedent to the Scriptural record. Thus in regard to the New Testament the Revelation was mediated and apprehended, the Christian faith existed and was stated and believed and taught, before the various scriptures it contains were in being.

There was a preparatory revelation to Israel (of which the Old Testament is the record), and there is a complete and supreme revelation in the Person, words, and works of the Lord Jesus

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, i. 1.

[2] cf. the memorable words of Hugh Binning (*Works*, 1735, pp. 69f.): 'The Lord speaks to us in Scripture of Himself, according to our capacities of His Face, His Right Hand and Arm, His Throne, His Sceptre, His Anger, His Fury, His Repentance, His Grief and Sorrow; none of which are properly in His spiritual, immortal and unchangeable nature; but because our dulness and slowness is such in apprehending things spiritual, it being almost without the sphere and comprehension of the soul while in the body, which is almost addicted unto the senses of the body; therefore the Lord accommodates Himself unto our terms and notions; *balbutit nobiscum*, He like a kind Father stammers with His stammering children, speaks to them in their own dialect; but withal would have us conceive He is not really such a One, but infinitely removed in His own Being from all these imperfections. So when ye hear of these terms in Scripture, O beware ye conceive God to be such a one as yourselves; But, in these expressions not beseeming His Majesty, because below Him, learn your own ignorance of His glorious Majesty, your dulness and incapacity to be such, as the Holy One must come down as it were in some bodily appearance ere you can understand anything of Him.'

Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God, in whom the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily;[1] which was interpreted and proclaimed by those chosen Apostles and Witnesses whom the Holy Ghost taught and enabled to understand and to express it as an everlasting Gospel. To them 'the Faith' was 'once for all delivered',[2] and they in turn delivered it 'to faithful men who should be able to teach others'.[3] Afterwards (as says the *Confession of Faith*) by the care and providence of God, the same was wholly committed to Scripture. The Faith did not make its first appearance in a written but in an oral form: it existed, was preached, believed, and transmitted for some time before it began to have expression in inspired writings. When those writings appeared, they did not supersede the unwritten Faith which the Apostolic witnesses communicated to the Church, nor did they add to it. They are a photograph of that Faith in the process of transmission, and thus became the standard of reference for verifying the content of the Faith. The Tradition of the Apostles expressed itself and took its final form in these Scriptures in obedience to the Spirit of Truth sent by Christ Himself. Thus the Scriptures of the New Testament give us, in regard to the whole Revelation of God, the complete mind of the teaching Church during the age and under the censorship of the Apostles in its obedient transmission and faithful understanding of the Revelation of Christ in Word and Act.[4] They supply us with sections cut across the thought of those men 'who had the mind of Christ'. The Church teaches that this process of

[1] Col. ii. 9. Because in Jesus Christ God has condescended to reveal and give Himself to us in human form and has reconciled our humanity to Himself, it is by reference to the *Incarnation* that we have to understand the human forms in which Divine Revelation is accommodated to our capacity and adapted to our apprehensions both in the Old Testament and in the New Testament. As it is only by the power of the Spirit that we are enabled to recognize Jesus as Lord, so it is only by the power of the same Spirit that we are able to recognize the human speech of the Bible as the Word of God. This method of understanding and interpreting Holy Scripture is known in Reformed theology as *according to the analogy of faith.*

[2] Jude 3.

[3] 2 Tim. ii. 2.

[4] In the Epistles of St. Paul we can discover the whole process of operation:
(*a*) He 'delivers' (as he has received) the fundamental facts of the Gospel (e.g. 1 Cor. xv. 1–8).
(*b*) He authoritatively deduces inferences from these and states them dogmatically (ibid., 21–28, 42–54).
(*c*) He tries and judges opinion and teaching as it emerges in the Church (ibid., 12–19, 29–41).
(*d*) He reasons from Christian truth to the Christian Spirit and practice (ibid., 55–58)—'the way of the Lord Jesus'.

record was wholly providential, not accidental.[1] It proceeded under the Hand of God, and by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Thus the New Testament Scriptures are the instrument divinely elected and formed, the authentic means, of God's Revelation to His Church in all ages. They fill the place which in the first generation was occupied by the living voice and authority of Christ Himself through His chosen witnesses, for through them wherever they are proclaimed or expounded from generation to generation it is the same living Christ who declares His Word, reveals and offers Himself as Saviour and Lord.[2]

'The authority of Holy Scripture' accordingly, 'for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the teaching of any man or Church, but wholly upon God . . . and therefore is to be received, because it is the Word of God.'[3] In submitting itself to the rule of the Scriptures, it is to the Divine Council that conscience bows, not to the Ecclesiastical or even to the Apostolic mind: and it is to Divine Promise that the heart adheres. Holy Scripture bears in itself the evidence of this Divine origin and sanction; it carries with it 'the testimony of the Holy Spirit'. The Christian experience of every age has verified this statement, so that the Church universally and unhesitatingly affirms Scripture to be the Word of God. 'Our full persuasion and assurance of the infallible truth and Divine authority thereof is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit bearing witness by and with the Word in our hearts.'[4] Divine care, then, stood over the historical process of record, and a divine appointment moved within it; these together ensuring the result that the Scriptures faithfully mediate God's Revelation and fully cover the whole field occupied by the Faith. Nothing may be taught as requisite to salvation, or imposed as a term of communion with the Church, which cannot be discovered in Scripture and verified as part of its teachings. 'The whole counsel of God concerning all things necessary for His own glory, man's salvation, faith and life, are either expressly set down in Scripture, or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from Scripture, unto which nothing at any time is to be added, whether by new revelations of the Spirit, or traditions of men.'[5]

[1] 'It pleased the Lord . . . to commit the same . . . unto writing' (*Conf. of Faith*, i. 1).
[2] See T. H. L. Parker, *Essays in Christology for Karl Barth*, pp. 21–7.
[3] *Conf. of Faith*, i. 4. [4] Ibid., i. 5. [5] Ibid., i. 6.

The duty of the Church towards the Scriptures, is, accordingly, twofold. She has (1) to preserve them inviolate and to be the jealous guardian of their letter: (2) to teach and command, altogether and only, in agreement with what they authorize—'to make them the test of her rule of Faith and Morals, guided always by the standard of *It is written*, to open out their contents to her own children, showing always that what she teaches they approve as the Apostolic Gospel, and to promulgate them to the world, as law of liberty and as containing the very word of God'.[1] The Church stands to the Divine Law as a steward, not as a master.[2]

CREED OF THE CHURCH

(1) *What is 'Creed'?*

The Faith of the Church which is contained in Holy Scripture is set forth in its essentials in the 'Creeds'. The Word 'Creed' is limited in proper use to mean a statement of those beliefs which, when held by a man, make him in faith a Christian, and are necessary to him as a Christian. 'Creed' means *the Faith which was once for all delivered to the Saints; 'the Gospel . . . which ye have received, and wherein ye stand'*.[3]

(2) *Creed and Gospel*

The Gospel was taught at first orally, that is, by word of mouth. It had many teachers, but was recognized as one Faith:[4] its teachers were in agreement in stating it, as its disciples were in receiving it. For purposes of testing and ascertaining agreement, the Gospel must have received formulated statement. There is abundant evidence in the New Testament of this formulation. When St. Paul, e.g., 'communicated' to Saints Peter, James, and John at Jerusalem 'that Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles',[5] and when the truth of his presentation of the Gospel was acknowledged by them, he and they must have enunciated and compared the points, historical and doctrinal, which all of them alike made the basis of their evangelization. St. Paul, again, had not himself

[1] H. J. Wotherspoon, *Pentecostal Gift* (Maclehose, Glasgow, 1903), p. 74.

[2] 'The Church cannot legislate upon doctrine, in the common sense of the term. Her legislation of that class, to be legitimate, can be nothing but construing—construing the Word of God according to the analogy of the Faith' (W. E. Gladstone, *Correspondence upon the Church*, &c., i. 109).

[3] Jude 3; 1 Cor. xv. 1. [4] 1 Cor. xv. 2. [5] Gal. ii. 2.

visited Rome, when he wrote his Epistle to the Romans; but he is able to assume that Roman Christians both know and hold a body of fact and truth common to them and him as to other believers.[1] He calls this 'the pattern of teaching to which they had been delivered',[2] and commends them for their obedience to it. As St. Paul did not found the Roman Church, the 'pattern' had not been 'delivered' by him, and his knowledge and mention of it point to the existence of an outline of the essentials of the Faith, generally recognized.[3] So, again, his words to the Corinthians[4] imply his own use of an ordered form of presenting the Gospel, and the identity of this with a form recognized as authoritative. 'Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the Gospel which I preached': he had, therefore, given them the Gospel in a form definite and orderly, so as to be retained in the memory. What he delivered to them was what he himself had 'received', and he is confident that he can tell what any other true Evangelists who had visited them must have taught: 'therefore', he says, 'whether it were I or they, so we preached'. This appeal to memory, this challenge regarding the teaching which others gave, could hardly be possible unless there were a form of essentials to which St. Paul had regard, and to which he knew that other Evangelists would have had regard in preaching the Gospel. From this recognized presentation of Christianity St. Paul instances so much as is germane to his immediate topic, namely, the Resurrection of the Dead—'that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures'.[5]

St. Paul, again, urges St. Timothy to hold fast 'the form of sound words'[6] (the 'good thing committed to him'), and he repeatedly refers to the 'teaching'—the things that Timothy had heard—which he was to deliver to others as they had been delivered to him. This form of teaching or deposit can hardly be other than the 'good confession'[7] of Christ, which Timothy is reminded he had witnessed before many witnesses. That, again, must be identified with[8] 'the faith once for all delivered to the

[1] Rom. vi. 17. [2] Rom. vi. 17, R.V.; cf. xvi. 17.
[3] 'The Apostles and Evangelists who went about two by two . . . must have had a fixed basis for the instruction they gave' (Soltau, *Unsere Evangelien*, p. 85, quoted by J. Denney, *The Death of Christ*, p. 81).
[4] 1 Cor. xv. 1. [5] 1 Cor. xv. 9.
[6] 2 Tim. i. 13, 14, ii. 2, iii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 20. [7] 1 Tim. vi. 12.
[8] Heb. x. 23.

saints',[1] for which St. Jude exhorts us to contend earnestly. What is apparently a rhythmical or mnemonic version of such a profession is quoted by St. Paul in 1 Tim. iii. 16.

(3) *The Apostles' Creed*[2]

The particular occasion of the consolidation of this oral Gospel into the form of confession of personal belief arose in the requirement of such a confession from Catechumens at the time of their Baptism.[3] The Catholic Creeds—'Apostles' and 'Nicene'—are in part, at least, expansions of the Baptismal formula delivered to us by our Lord—the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The candidate was originally required to state his faith as to each of the three Divine Persons: 'What believest thou of the Father? What believest thou of the Son? What believest thou of the Holy Ghost?' In course of time the replies which candidates were instructed to make coalesced into one consecutive statement which was known as the *Symbolum* or pass-word, possibly so-called as the grounds of recognition at the gate of the fold, and as the bond of disciple with disciple. Frequently this formula of faith was not communicated until the eve of Baptism. It was transmitted orally, being seldom committed to writing in the earlier ages, in order to preserve its character as 'the pass-word' and also to protect it from possible profanation by heathen opponents. As late as the fifth century, St. Augustine says in regard to this, 'Let your memory be your book'. Hence there is difficulty in tracing the history of the Creed in the first age. But the primitive existence of such a formula, and its direct descent from our Lord's own words at the Institution of Baptism, are sufficiently clear.[4] Being unwritten and in constant use, while it

[1] Jude 3.

[2] As to the name 'Apostles' Creed', at the close of the fourth century a tradition existed that this symbol was produced by the Apostles in collaboration, each one of the Twelve contributing a clause or article. There is no ground for this explanation of the title. It may be truly called the Apostles' Creed, however, as being (*a*) in full agreement with the Apostolic Gospel, and as being (*b*) the historical descendant and representative of the Gospel message as originally cast into form suitable for delivery by word of mouth. For a careful analysis of the formation of the Creed see Oscar Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*.

[3] St. Paul's reference to Timothy's confessing the good confession before many witnesses is, almost unquestionably, a reference to his Baptism.

[4] St. Paul's language in 1 Cor. xv. 3–4 strongly suggests that of the corresponding clauses in the Creed. St. Ignatius, writing during the reign of Trajan (A.D. 98–117), often uses phraseology which seems reminiscent of its form and substance (cf. Epp. *ad Ephes.*, vii, xvii, *ad Trall.*, ix, *ad Smyrn.*, i).

was substantially the same everywhere, its precise terms varied in different Churches and regions, and many versions are extant. The 'Apostles' Creed', as used by us, is one of these versions—the ancient Roman—completed by the addition of clauses from those of other Churches.[1] Throughout the Eastern Churches all other symbols have, since the fourth century, been superseded by the Nicene, but in the Western Churches the Apostles' Creed has continued to be used along with the Nicene both as a basis of catechizing and in worship, and it is universally accepted by them.

(4) *The Nicene Creed*[2]

The 'Nicene Creed' is the deliberately accepted formula of Faith for the whole Catholic Church. The Apostles' Creed is a traditional and spontaneous outgrowth of the life and practice of the Church; the Nicene is the result of consultation and resolution. It gives larger expression to the truths of the Divine Person, and of the Divine and Human Natures of our Saviour, and of the Divine Person of the Holy Ghost. These truths, having been made subjects of dispute, were asserted by General Councils of the Church—those of Nicaea (A.D. 325), Constantinople (A.D. 381), Ephesus (A.D. 431), and Chalcedon (A.D. 451). Two Creeds, slightly differing from one another, were accepted and promulgated as orthodox by the decisions of these Councils, of which one was that which we commonly call the Nicene.[3]

From the latter half of the fifth century, the 'Nicene Creed' has been recited at the Celebration of Holy Communion.

(5) *Function of the Creeds*

The Catholic Creeds, which are abundantly verified by Holy Scripture, and teach only what the Scriptures prove, constitute an additional witness to the primitive Gospel. The Books of the New Testament present us with the Faith as it was *taught*, and as it was applied by individuals to particular circumstances and needs. The Creeds preserve the Faith as it was *received* by the body of the

[1] The latest of these additions was made about A.D. 650.

[2] See J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds* (Longmans, 1950).

[3] Strictly speaking, the name is inaccurate. Our 'Nicene Creed', based apparently on the Baptismal Creed of the Church of Jerusalem, was promulgated by the Council of Chalcedon (A.D. 451) co-ordinately with the somewhat different form originally published by the Council of Nicaea (A.D. 325). But the former was in existence before the date of the Council of Constantinople (381).

Church, and the sense in which it was understood by those who received it. The Creeds represent the agreement of the body of the Members as to what they had been taught—how they had 'learned Christ', and what they found necessary and sufficient as a foundation of Christian hope and life.

The Holy Scriptures and the Catholic Creeds have a parallel but distinct descent from the oral Apostolic teaching of the first age, which they directly represent. The Creeds were not formed merely by a process of extraction from Scripture, but have flowed down to us by the channel of the continuous life of the Church, from the fountain of the original 'delivery of the Faith', 'which it pleased the Lord afterwards to commit to writing'[1] in the form of the New Testament. The Creeds serve the supremely important end of indicating and emphasizing, amid the abundant variety and detail of Scripture, those matters which were recognized from the first as truly 'fundamental' and 'essential'—such as our Church has called the 'grand mysteries of the Gospel' and 'the great and fundamental truths'.[2]

It is by no means impossible to express in language which is entirely scriptural systems of doctrine widely divergent from each other, yet all of them alien to that truth which created and has sustained the Church. Most heresies have professed to argue from Scripture. But the authority possessed by a collection of extracts from Scripture is not the authority of Scripture, but only such as may be attached to the theological competency, religious judgement, and personal tendencies of the individual who determines the selection. The Catholic Creeds furnish the Church with a safeguard, and give the Christian a protection against attempts of the kind. In them we see the Church fulfilling two of its essential functions—in the Apostles' Creed providing for the instruction and testing of candidates for her membership: in the Nicene, for the rejection of false additions to the truth, and of erroneous explanations of the mysteries of the Faith.

(6) *The Creeds in the Reformed Church*

At the Reformation the Catholic Creeds remained in full authority, and were, at the least, assumed as the basis and background of all the various 'Confessions' of the Reformed Churches.

[1] *Conf. of Faith*, i. 1; see Article on Scripture.
[2] *Acts of Assembly*, 1696 and 1720.

Those to which the name 'Reformed'[1] was distinctively applied, amongst which was the Church of Scotland, made this adherence explicit and formal in the great historical document adopted by them in testimony of their common orthodoxy and of their Catholic position.[2] All their Catechisms took the form of exposition of the Apostles' Creed, and provided for its repetition. Their worship constantly included it. In the Church of Scotland, the 'Book of Common Order'[3] prescribed its recitation after Sermon in all ordinary services. The law of the Church required that it should be professed by sponsors at Baptism, and ability to repeat it was a condition of admission to the Lord's Table.[4] The Scottish representatives at the Westminster Assembly contended vehemently for the retention of these usages, but, in face of opposition from English Puritanism, were able to secure only, and with difficulty, that the Creed should be retained as a catechetical standard contingent with the Shorter Catechism.[5]

The contents of both Apostles' and Nicene Creeds are embodied, even to their most technical phraseology, in the Westminster Standards, both the *Confession* and the *Catechisms*.[6] For present usage the Church of Scotland has authorized the *Directory for the Public Worship of God*, and *The Book of Common Order*, 1940. The former remains its authoritative Directory, the latter is the accepted Service book of the Church in common use. In it the Apostles' Creed is prescribed for the weekly service, and the Nicene or Apostles' Creed for use in the Communion Service. The Nicene Creed is recited in the Communion Service used by the General Assembly.

FAITHFULNESS OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TO CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

'Catholic Doctrine' means the doctrine of the Catholic Creeds, especially as concerns the Trinity of the Godhead and the Deity

[1] I.e. in the technical language of the time, as distinct from 'Protestant' or 'Lutheran'.

[2] *The Second Helvetic Confession*, v, chapter on 'Faithfulness', &c.

[3] Called 'Knox's Liturgy'.

[4] See Sprott, *Worship and Offices*, pp. 65, 84, W. D. Maxwell, *History of Worship in the Church of Scotland*, pp. 58, 61, 62 (see footnote quotation from J. M. Barkley).

[5] In the standard editions of the Catechism a note is appended to the Creed explaining, *inter alia*, that it is 'annexed', 'because it is a brief sum of the Christian Faith, agreeable to the Word of God, and anciently received in the Churches of Christ'.

[6] See as to this the chapter on 'Faithfulness', &c.

of our Saviour, and of the unchallenged Ecumenical Councils concerning His Person and natures. The Reformation everywhere assumed and proceeded upon this Doctrine and sought not only to rehabilitate it but to reform the life and faith of the Church in accordance with it. Every Reformed Communion propounded its 'Confession'—often one Confession after another—both to proclaim its adherence to Apostolic and Catholic doctrine and to bring the confessing Church into living conformity to the Word of God; but every Reformed Communion maintained its relation to the Creeds unaltered, and the various Confessions were supplementary to the Creeds. The Catechisms, also, in which the Reformation was prolific, are without exception expositions of the Baptismal Symbol supplemented by the Nicene Creed.

The Church of Scotland occupied no other position towards Catholic Doctrine than did the other Reformed Communions. To Catholic Doctrine its relation is absolutely regular and clear. As already stated, the Apostles' Creed continued without interruption to be recited in its services and to be required in the administration of Baptism. The same Creed was its basis of religious instruction. The Catechisms (namely, of *Geneva* and *Heidelberg*) authorized in the first period of the Reformed Church of Scotland are, in their doctrinal parts, based upon this Creed, article by article. The same applies to all the official Catechisms of the Church of Scotland until the acceptance of the Westminster standards. The Apostles' Creed is and has always been a catechetical standard, and, although its order was not followed by the longer and shorter Catechisms of Westminster, it was annexed to them 'because it is a brief sum of the Christian Faith, agreeable to the Word of God, and anciently received in the Churches of Christ'.

FORMAL RELATION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TO THE NICENE CREED AND THE COUNCILS

(1) One of the earliest Acts of the General Assembly after the Reformation was to adhere, along with the Reformed Churches of Hungary, Poland, France, Switzerland, and the Palatinate, to a Confession known as the *Second Helvetic*, which was expressly designed to exhibit their agreement in orthodoxy. This declares in the Eleventh Chapter:

We sincerely believe and freely profess whatsoever Things are defined out of the Holy Scriptures in the Creeds, and in the decrees of those first four and most excellent Councils—held at Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon—together with blessed Athanasius' Creed, and all Creeds like to these; touching the mystery of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, and we condemn all things contrary to the same.

Thus [it is continued] we retain the Christian sound and Catholic Faith, whole and inviolable, knowing that nothing is contained in the aforesaid Creeds which is not agreeable to the Word of God, and makes wholly for the uncorrupt declaration of the Faith.

The Helvetic Confession makes in its preface a claim and protest that inasmuch as all its signatories are of the Faith and religion specified in the ancient laws of Christendom as Catholic: 'They shall be held not for heretics, but for Catholics and Christians.' The signatories in Scotland included Knox, Craig, Winram, and Row, who thus adhered to the profession of Catholic doctrine, and to the claim that they were Catholic Christians. The adherence of the Scottish Reformers to these statements of the Helvetic Confession was ratified in two subsequent Assemblies, of which one was the Glasgow Assembly of 1638. No corporate action of the Church has been more deliberate, none possesses more authority, than this by which the Church asserts its right to the name of Catholic, and its possession of Catholic Doctrine.

(2) It is certain that 'the Westminster Confession contains everything that is in the Nicene Creed'.[1] Those matters of doctrine which concern the Person and Natures of the Redeemer,[2] which were defined by the Councils of Ephesus, Chalcedon and Constantinople, are treated by the Westminster Confession in the very terms employed by these Councils.[3]

In their doctrines of the Holy Trinity, of the work as well as the Person of Christ, of man and of salvation, the Confessions both of 1560 and of 1647 follow the teaching of the great theologian for the East, Athanasius, and the teaching of the great doctor of the West, Augustine, universally recognized as authoritative teachers in the Church Catholic.

(3) Not only in the Westminster Confession (1647): the Scots Confession of 1560 is equally explicit, as follows:

'We acknowledge and confess one only God, to whom we must cleave

[1] James Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel*, 1908, pp. 391–2.
[2] *Conf. of Faith*, ii. 3. [3] Ibid., viii. 1, 2, 'The Person of Christ'.

and serve, whom we must worship, in whom only we must put our trust, who is eternal, infinite, incomprehensible, omnipotent, One in substance yet in Three Persons, The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, by whom we believe and confess all things in heaven and earth, as well visible as invisible, to have been created' (Art. I). 'When the fulness of time came, God sent His Son, His eternal Wisdom, the substance of His own glory, into this world, who took the nature of manhood of the substance of woman, to wit of a Virgin, and that by operation of the Holy Ghost, and so was born the just seed of David, the very Messias promised, whom we confess and acknowledge Immanuel, Very God and Very Man, two perfect natures united and joined in One Person, by which our confession we condemn the . . . pestilent heresies of Arius, Marcion, Eutyches, Nestorius, and such others, as did either deny the eternity of His Godhead, or the Verity of His human nature, or confounded them, or yet divided them' (Art. IV).

The Church of Scotland has constantly adhered to her Confession. To James II her Presbyterian Ministers avowed that 'their principles were, according to the Word of God, contained in that Confession'.[1] Under William III she had it established by law as her public and avowed confession. Under Anne she insisted that it should be ratified and confirmed in the Act of Union of 1707. When, on two occasions after the Revolution, she felt called upon to speak of the things in the Confession that she deemed most essential—against the Deists in 1696, and to enjoin upon her ministers the preaching of the catechetical doctrine in 1720—it was on the doctrines common to the Confession with the Ancient Creeds that in both cases she laid primary stress, in the earlier Act enumerating first among the 'grand Mysteries of the Gospel', 'the Incarnation of the Messias'; and in the later, 'the great and fundamental truths according to our Confessions and Catechisms, such as that of the Being and Providence of God, and the Divine Authority of the Holy Scriptures, the necessary doctrine of the ever-blessed Trinity in the Unity of the Godhead, and particularly the eternal Deity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ'. When at a later period of the same century, there appeared some likelihood of an infection of Scotland by the Arianism and Socinianism which were already current among the English and Irish Presbyterians, the Moderates, under the wise leadership of Principal Robertson, refused to listen to proposals for changing the Confession.

The Evangelical Seceders from 1733 to 1843 were of the like mind; one and all they took the Confession and the Catechisms with them; and in many a case of alleged heresy—from that of Simson to that of Edward Irving—both parties in the Church insisted, without a moment's

[1] Wodrow, *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*, vol. iii, p. 11n.

wavering, that, whatever else was fundamental, the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, 'according to our Confession of Faith', were so most certainly.

The Assembly of 1889 passed a Declaratory Act which, while 'desiring to enlarge rather than curtail any liberty heretofore enjoyed, and to relieve subscribers from unnecessary burdens as to forms of expression and matters which do not enter into the substance of Faith', 'declared at the same time the adherence of the Church to the Confession of Faith as its public and avowed Confession, and containing the sum and substance of the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches'. The Act of Parliament which the Church obtained in 1905 recognizes (and may be thought to reinforce) the position which the Confession has held among us since 1647 and 1690.[1]

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND: ITS HISTORY AS A BRANCH OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

The origin of the Scottish Branch of the Catholic Church dates from the period of the occupation of Britain by Imperial Rome. The Christianity then imported by soldiers and colonists extended on the West Coast at least as far as the Firth of Clyde. The Gospel was possibly carried farther still by Romanized Britons. Tertullian (died *c.* 220) speaks of 'the haunts of the Britons inaccessible to the Romans, but subjugated to Christ'.[2]

The missions of St. Ninian,[3] himself a Pict (A.D. 362–432), to the Picts of Galloway, and of Central and Eastern Scotland, and the mission of St. Patrick from Scotland to Ireland (A.D. 432–61)—concerning both of which we have definite information—took place while Britain was still regarded as a portion of the Empire.

Thus through the continuous Christianity of Strathclyde, the Church of Scotland claims to rank as a branch borne on the root of primitive Christianity, calling no other branch its Mother.

The National Church of Scotland, as it now exists, and has existed since the twelfth century, is, however, the result of a coalescence of various elements, corresponding to those whose combination formed the medieval Scottish State. The mission of

[1] *The Duty of the Church according to her Lord's Commission*, 'Doctrine', pp. 9–10 (Edinburgh, 1910). See *Articles Declaratory of the Constitution of the Church of Scotland*, Appendix O, p. 120.

[2] Tertullian, *An Answer to the Jews*, Chap. vii.

[3] See A. R. MacEwen, *A History of the Church of Scotland*, vol. I; J. A. Duke, *The Columban Church*, and J. H. S. Burleigh, *A Church History of Scotland* (1960); also *Fathers of the Kirk* (ed. R. S. Wright, 1960).

St. Ninian and his disciples, which apparently penetrated the whole level coast of Scotland, as far as and including Caithness—whatever may have been the defections of the fifth and early sixth centuries—undoubtedly paved the way for the more complete evangelization which followed. In the early part of the sixth century a Christian Kingdom—the original Scot-land—was formed in Argyllshire by conquest and colonization from Ulster. This led indirectly to the conversion of the mountainous region of North Pictland, which was effected in the sixth century and onwards by a magnificent series of missions from Ireland. The typical representative of the Irish mission was St. Columba, a recompense to Scotland for her own gift of St. Patrick.

In the course of the eighth century consolidation began by the union of the crowns of North and South Pictland; and in 844 Scots and Picts merged into one kingdom under Kenneth MacAlpine.

The result in relation to the Church appears in the appointment of Tuathal, Abbot of Dunkeld, as Bishop of Fortrenn: that is to say, the successor of St. Columba and heir of his primacy in the Church of the Scots and their missions became Bishop of the Picts. In this we recognize the union of the Church of the Scots and Picts. The *name* 'Scottish Church'—*Ecclesia Scoticana*—first appears in the course of the following reign (Girig, 878–89), in connexion with the liberation of the Church from certain secular exactions.

Under Malcolm Canmore (1057–93) the British principality of Strathclyde, whose primaeval Christianity had been revived and extended by St. Kentigern of Glasgow, the contemporary of St. Columba, came under the authority of the Scottish crown, to which it was definitely annexed in the reign of Malcolm's son. St. David. The territory of Bernicia (that is, the Lothians and Merse), upon which the Scots had maintained a hold since the battle of Carham (1018), was also definitely attached to Malcolm's crown. This, together with the rest of Northumbria, had been evangelized from Iona; but since 664 it had adhered to Roman in preference to Celtic usages.

Finally, the absorption of a Scandinavian element in the extreme north of Scotland and the Western Islands, which ecclesiastically and politically were for long dependent on Norway, gave Scotland its present frontiers. But it was not until 1469 that the Orkney and

Shetland Islands came under the Scottish crown as part of the dowry of Margaret of Denmark, bride of James III.

Such were the constituent elements of the Scottish Church and State.

The Celtic type of Church life, developed as it was during a period of separation from the main current of European history, was in many particulars widely different from that which was prevalent on the Continent of Europe. In the Columban Church *jurisdiction* was monastic, not episcopal. *Easter* was observed on a date fixed by a method which, during the time of isolation, had been elsewhere replaced by one more exact. There were other peculiarities, chiefly survivals of earlier usage, possibly in some details derived from Eastern Christianity. Since the Celtic Church regarded the Patriarchate of Rome as limited by the frontiers of the Empire, it was decidedly disinclined to acknowledge the Roman supremacy or to recognize any duty of conformity to the practice of Rome merely as such. In the matter of the date of Easter, which had aroused the first and sharpest controversy, the Celtic Church accepted the general Western usage by A.D. 716. In many other respects, however, it maintained its distinctive organization and discipline until a much later period. *Diocesan* Episcopacy, for example, was unknown in Celtic Scotland until the twelfth century; previously to that there was a single 'Bishop of the Scots'.[1] The marriage of Malcolm Canmore to the Saxon Princess Margaret initiated, however, a movement towards conformity with the territorial system elsewhere general. *Dioceses* were formed, and these were subdivided into parishes. Against the claims of Canterbury and York *Ecclesiastical autonomy* was secured in A.D. 1188. Although the price paid for securing independence of these English claims was acknowledgement of the more absolute supremacy of the Roman See, such supremacy has been allowed by the Church of Scotland for less than four out of the many centuries of its existence. For, in the middle of the sixteenth century the controversy with Rome was reopened, the Church of Scotland revised its relation to that see, and definitely rejected the papal obedience. It reasserted its responsibility as a national Church and its consequent right and duty to correct error and to reform abuse in its own practice. The Reformation which resulted has in no way affected identity, but on the contrary reaffirmed and strengthened

[1] i.e. *with jurisdiction.*

the unity and continuity of the Church of Scotland with the One Church Apostolic and Catholic.

The Reformation in Scotland was the obedient response of the Church to the call of God to put its house in order, to pare away the medieval growth of innovations and improvisations that obscured the face of the Catholic Church and caused it to deviate from its apostolic foundation in Christ. The Reformed Church of Scotland claimed, and still claims, to be none other than the one Church of God in Scotland, insisting on remaining ever identical with itself (*semper eadem*) in its apostolic origin and Catholic continuity by rebuttal of aberrations and deviations from the integrity of the Catholic and Apostolic faith of the Early Church. Against all attempts to alter the Church by changing its foundation in the Faith once delivered to the Saints, whether by unwarranted addition or by deforming subtractions, the Church in Scotland clung faithfully to its unity with the Church of the Apostolic and Catholic Fathers. The Reformation represented, therefore, in no sense a movement to found a new Church, or even to refound the Church, but the living obedience of the Church to its one Lord acting according to its own divinely-given Apostolic and Catholic norms and standards. As such it continues to be the Church Reformed relying upon the Promise of Christ that the gates of hell will not prevail against it and insisting on maintaining its integrity from generation to generation by continuous obedience and conformity to Jesus Christ the sole King and Head of the Church.

IV

Ministry

'THERE is one general Church visible held forth in the New Testament.'[1] The visible Church, Catholic or Universal, is the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the House and Family of God.[2] 'Unto this Catholic visible Church Christ hath given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God, for the gathering and perfecting of the saints in this life and to the end of the world, and doth by His own presence and Spirit according to his promise make them effectual thereunto.'[3] 'Christ hath instituted a government and governors ecclesiastical in His Church: to that purpose the Apostles did immediately receive the keys from the hand of Jesus Christ and did use and exercise them in all the Churches of the world upon all occasions. And Christ hath since continually furnished some in His Church with gifts of government, and with commission to exercise the same,[4] when called thereunto.'

Ordination is always to be continued in the Church. It is the act of the Presbytery. The power of ordering is in the *whole Presbytery*, but the act may be fulfilled by the Presbytery or the ministers sent from them for ordination.[5] The act of ordination is to be performed with all due care, wisdom, gravity and solemnity.[6] 'Every Minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong',[7] 'who being set apart themselves for the work of the

[1] *Form of Church Govt.*, par. 1. [2] *Conf. of Faith*, xxv. 2.

[3] Ibid., xxv. 3; *Form of Church Govt.*: 'Of the Church': 'The ministry, oracles, and ordinances of the New Testament, are given by Jesus Christ to the general church visible for the gathering and perfecting of it in this life, until His second coming.'

[4] *Form of Church Govt.*, 'Of Church-Government'. See also *The Second Helvetic Confession*, xviii.

[5] *Form of Church Govt.*, 'Touching the Power of Ordination' and 'Rules'.

[6] Ibid., 'The Directory for the Ordination of Ministers'.

[7] Ibid., 'Touching the Doctrine of Ordination'. The office of preaching as a general part of the Pastor's duty had largely fallen into abeyance before the Reformation, and was for the most part left to the Friars. A good deal is explained by the determination of the Reformers to insist on capacity to preach as a necessary qualification either in Presbyter or Bishop. Priests who could not preach were limited to employment as Readers.

Ministry, have power to join in the setting apart of others'.[1] Records are carefully to be kept of the names of persons ordained, and of the presbyters who did impose hands upon them.[2]

In this act of ordination the Church of Scotland, as part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church worshipping one God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, affirms anew its belief in the Gospel of the sovereign grace and love of God, wherein through Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord, incarnate, crucified, and risen, He freely offers to all men, upon repentance and faith, the forgiveness of sins, renewal by the Holy Spirit, and eternal life, and calls them to labour in the fellowship of faith for the advancement of the kingdom of God throughout the world.

The Church of Scotland acknowledges the Word of God, which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, to be the supreme rule of faith and life.

The Church of Scotland holds as its subordinate standard the Westminster Confession of Faith, recognizing liberty of opinion on such points of doctrine as do not enter into the substance of the Faith, and claiming the right, in dependence on the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit, to formulate, interpret, or modify its subordinate standards: always in agreement with the word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian Faith contained in the said Confession, of which agreement the Church itself shall be sole judge.[3]

It belongs to the office of the minister to pray for and with his flock, as the mouth of the people unto God; to pray for the sick; to read the Scriptures publicly, to feed the flock by preaching the Word;[4] to catechize; to dispense other divine mysteries; to administer the Sacraments; to bless the people from God;[5] to take care of the poor; and to rule over the flock as a pastor.[6] In

[1] *Form of Church Govt.*, 'Rules'. [2] Ibid.

[3] *Ordinal and Service Book*, 1954, p. 13; see *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 1958, vol. xi, 3, pp. 225–52.

[4] 'It appertains to the Pastor to pray for the people, and namely for the Flock committed to his charge, to blesse them in the name of the Lord, who will not suffer the Blessings of His faithfull servants to be frustrat.' *Second Book of Discipline*, IV. 8.

[5] The Biblical justification for this ministry is given on the following ground: 'That the priests and levites in the Jewish Church were trusted with the public reading of the Word is proved (Deut. xxxi. 9–11; Neh. viii. 1–3, 13). That the ministers of the Gospel have as ample a charge and commission to dispense the Word, as well as other ordinances, as the priests and levites had under the Law, is proved Isa. lxvi. 21; Matt. xxiii. 34, where our Saviour entitleth the officers of the New Testament, whom He will send forth, by the same names as the teachers of the Old.' *Form of Church Govt.*, 'Pastors'.

[6] Ibid.

this last function (of ruling) are associated with the minister certain others, 'which officers reformed Churches commonly call Elders'.[1]

In terms like these the Church of Scotland states its doctrine of 'lawful Ministry' as one of the things necessary 'to make the face of a Christian Church'.[2]

The first step taken by our Blessed Lord towards the constitution of the Church was the calling, ordaining, and commissioning of the Apostles. He said, 'As my Father hath sent me into the world, even so send I you.'[3] He said, 'He that receiveth you receiveth me.'[4] He said, 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.'[5] They were to be His 'chosen witnesses',[6] the princes of the New Israel having judicial authority over the whole church, wise master-builders,[7] foundations of the Church.[8] It was their ministry to mediate authoritatively the once-and-for-all Revelation in Christ which was deposited in the New Testament Scriptures and which was creative of the historical Church. As such the Apostles form the perpetually existing and unrepeatable foundation of the Church in all ages. Their Ministry, in direct appointment by Christ, was unique and cannot be transmitted, but by the ministry of the Word mediated to the Church through the Apostolic tradition of Revelation in the New Testament, their authoritative and judicial ministry continues to order and govern the life and mission of the Church.

In the Apostles as forming the foundation of the Church all ministry was contained, and from them only existing ministry is derived as a ministry dependent on the Apostles and ordered by them.[9] The Apostles chose and ordained men to be ministers,[10] not to succeed them in their unique Apostolic office, but to succeed to as much of their function as is transmissible,[11] namely a stewardship in the oracles and mysteries of God and a pastoral rule in the Church, with authority to ordain others in this continuing

[1] *Form of Church Govt.*, 'Other Church Governors'.
[2] Compare *Scots Confession*, 1560, xviii; cf. xxii. The others noted are: The Word truly preached; the Sacraments duly administered; and a godly discipline.
[3] John xx. 21. [4] Matt. x. 40; John xiii. 20. [5] Matt. xviii. 18.
[6] Acts i. 8, x. 41, &c. [7] 1 Cor. iii. 10. [8] Eph. ii. 20; Rev. xxi. 14.
[9] See J. B. Lightfoot, *Philippians*, 'Dissertation', p. 187; cf. J. Armitage Robinson, *Early History of Church and Ministry*, p. 81; J. K. S. Reid, *The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry*; A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Ministry*.
[10] Acts xiv. 23; 2 Tim. i. 6, ii. 2; Titus i. 5.
[11] See G. Hill, *Lectures on Divinity*, VI. ii. 2.

ministry dependent on the Apostles. Accordingly the Apostles ordained these ministers not as they themselves were ordained, and therefore not as successors in their place, but by the laying on of hands with prayer as a subordinate and dependent ministry; and they in their turn exercised their ministry not with the judicial and oracular authority of the Apostles but only in subordination and obedience to the Apostolic Ministry and in conformity with the Apostolic teaching and ordinances. This is the ordained ministry that has continued throughout the Church until now, and may justly be called an 'Apostolic Ministry'.[1]

By their ordering of the Church in its foundation in Christ the Apostles provided the historical Church with an institutional ministry within the authority and sphere of their own Apostolic commission from the historical and risen Jesus Christ. But throughout the life and mission of the Church in all ages the holy ministry derives directly from the ascended Lord who continues to send down gifts for the ministry upon His Church, so that whenever a man is called to the ministry of Word and Sacrament He is called and sent by Christ Himself and endowed with gifts for his office by the Spirit. But these gifts are exercised within the sphere of the Apostolic mission and commission and in conformity with the Apostolic ordering of the institutional ministry. The laying on of hands appointed by the Apostles to be used in ordaining men to the holy ministry attests that this ministry derives both *mediately* from the historical and risen Jesus through the Apostles and *immediately* from the ascended King and Head of the Church through the Holy Spirit. It is this twofold derivation from the One Lord that is the ground and justification of the Church's ministry from generation to generation.[2]

Ministry is thus not an ecclesiastical expedient; it is a *Divine Ordinance*. 'God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers; after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.'[3] 'HE [Christ ascended] gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers.'[4]

The Apostolic Ministry is a *perpetual* ordinance. It is 'till we

[1] Titus i. 5; 2 Tim. ii. 2; 1 Clement, 42, 44. See T. F. Torrance, *Royal Priesthood*, pp. 35ff., 66ff., *Conflict and Agreement in the Church*, vol. i, pp. 23ff., 214ff.
[2] *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 1958, vol. xi. 3, pp. 242ff.; *Church Quarterly Review*, 1959, vol. clx, 334, *The Doctrine of Order*, pp. 21–36.
[3] 1 Cor. xii. 28. [4] Eph. iv. 11.

all come . . . unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ'.[1] Christ said to the Apostles, 'Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world'[2]—a promise which could be fulfilled not to themselves personally, but only by His presence with those who in the world should continue to represent them.

It is further an *essential* ordinance, requisite to the being of the Christian Church. In the persons of the Apostles the Ministry historically preceded the Society, and was itself the germ and nucleus of the Church. 'The Apostles whom He had chosen' were the recipients of Christ's commandments for the Church:[3] in their keeping He instituted the Sacraments;[4] to them He committed discipline,[5] pastorate,[6] responsibility, and the authority which is the correlative of responsibility.[7] In the language of the Confession,[8] the Ministry is given 'for the gathering' as well as 'for the perfecting' of the Saints. That is to say (in the classical phraseology of our divines) it is 'the first depositary' of the keys of the Kingdom. In planting the Church where it has not yet existed, the presence of the Ministry is by itself sufficient: it carries with it, not only the Word to convert, but also Baptism to engraft, the Eucharist to nourish, government to set in order, discipline to guard, and the apostolic succession to provide a future Ministry.

The Ministry is *representative.* They who stand in it are *Christ's* Ministers,[9] and their ministerial acts are done in His Name,[10] being acts which are proper to Christ only, as Apostle of God, and Mediator of the New Covenant and High Priest over the House of God.[11] Insomuch as Christ's Mediation is twofold, being for God to man, and also for man to God, ministry in Christ's Name

[1] Eph. iv. 13. [2] Matt. xxviii. 20. [3] Acts i. 2.
[4] Matt. xxviii. 19, xxvi. 20ff. [5] John xxi. 15, 16.
[6] Matt. xxiv. 45–51; Luke xii. 42–48. [7] Luke x. 16; Heb. xiii. 7.
[8] *Conf. of Faith,* xxv. 3. [9] Ibid, xxix. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 1.

[10] 'To meet in Christ's Name' or 'to act in Christ's Name' (Matt. xviii. 19) is to meet or to act with Christ's authority in the order which He has appointed. Else Christ's Name is taken in vain. 'No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God as Aaron was.' For the manner of Aaron's calling, see Exod. xxviii–xxix.

[11] The Ministry does not represent the people before the Face of God. The Minister is not appointed by the people, nor is he their delegate, and is not therefore responsible to the people. He is sent by Christ and acts in Christ's Name, representing Him; and only because Christ—and He alone—represents the people vicariously before God does the minister represent the people *in Christ.* He is the servant of the Lord, not of the congregation, but *for Jesus' sake* he is their servant also; cf. *Royal Priesthood,* pp. 40f.

appears sometimes as ministry on behalf of the flock before God (as for example, in presentation of prayers and offerings, or in the earlier stage of the Eucharist),[1] and sometimes as ministry on behalf of God to the flock (as, for example, in preaching,[2] baptism, benediction, or in the later stage of the Eucharist).[3] Nevertheless, in all its ministrations alike the Ministry is Christ's, not the people's.[4] If sometimes it presents itself as representative of the people, that is because the action then in hand is one which belongs to Christ's mediation for His flock; and if sometimes it seems to act as representative of Christ to men, that is because the action is then one which belongs to His mediation for God. It belongs to Christ's office as High Priest, and to Him alone, to stand in for us before God[5] and plead His own Sacrifice,[6] to make intercession,[7] to present our prayers,[8] to offer our alms and gifts.[9] It belongs equally to Him alone to give forth the Gospel,[10] to wash from sin,[11] to feed with His Body and Blood,[12] to absolve from offence;[13] and to bless His people with peace.[14]

What therefore the Ministry does in this respect it does representatively, fulfilling a service rather than exercising a power. As the Baptist, when he was asked, 'What sayest thou of thyself?' replied, 'I am a voice,'[15] or as St. Peter repudiated as his act the healing of the impotent man and referred it to the agency of the ascended Lord,[16] for whom he was no more than a hand, so must the Ministry account of itself. It is, in one aspect, Christ's instrument to the Church. But the Church is itself a ministry and priesthood to the world; and in that aspect finds the official Ministry an organ bestowed upon it by Christ for the efficient exercise of that function. In either case Christ stands behind the Ministry, and the acts done in His Name receive effect from Him, who is the only Minister of the Grace of God, for in the Church's ministry He Himself is directly present in Spirit and Power.

[1] Acts xiii. 2; *Conf. of Faith*, xxix. 2, 'a spiritual oblation'.
[2] 2 Cor. v. 20. [3] See pp. 42f.
[4] The Church of Scotland does not hold the view that Ministry is representative merely of the universal Christian priesthood, as seems to be held by R. C. Moberly (*Ministerial Priesthood*, pp. 257–8), a view inconsistent with, for example, such functions as Benediction or the Preaching of His Word who now speaketh from Heaven. See *Practical Use of Saving Knowledge, Warrants to Believe*, ii. 5–8, *The Sum of Saving Knowledge, The Confessions of the Church of Scotland, etc.* (1725), pp. 416f.
[5] Heb. ix. 24. [6] Heb. ix. 24; Rev. v. 6; *Larger Catechism*, 55.
[7] Rom. viii. 34. [8] Heb. iv. 14–16. [9] Heb. xiii. 15.
[10] Heb. xii. 25. [11] 1 John i. 7. [12] John vi. 51–57.
[13] Acts v. 31. [14] John xiv. 27. [15] John i. 23. [16] Acts iii. 12–16.

This teaching has nowhere been better expressed than in some of the prayers of Calvin. 'Almighty God . . . Thou hast been pleased in thine infinite mercy not only to choose from among us some to be priests unto Thee, but also to consecrate us all to Thyself in Thine Only-begotten Son. . . .'[1] 'Grant, Almighty God, that since Thou hast deigned to take us as a priesthood to Thyself, and hast chosen us when we were not only of the lowest condition, but even profane and alien to all holiness, and hast consecrated us to Thyself by Thy Holy Spirit, that we may offer ourselves as holy victims to Thee,—O grant, that we may bear in mind our office and our calling, and sincerely devote ourselves to Thy service, and so present to Thee our efforts and our labours, that Thy Name may be truly glorified in us, and that it may really appear that we have been ingrafted into the Body of Thine Only-begotten Son; and as He is the Chief and the only true and perpetual Priest, may we become partakers of that priesthood with which Thou hast been pleased to honour Him, so that He may take us as associates to Himself; and may thus Thy Name be perpetually glorified by the Whole Body as well as by the Head. Amen.'[2]

The Ministry is thus a *Stewardship*: and its requisite is fidelity.[3] To it is committed the Word of Reconciliation,[4] and the trust of the mysteries of God,[5] and the pastorship of His flock.[6] For these things it stands in charge, and must give account.[7] This special responsibility of 'stewardship' cannot be shared or transferred, although no doubt there is also in the Church, in relation alike to service and the faith, a diffused responsibility of the highest importance. But while the flock must answer for its recognition of Christ's Voice,[8] and for its fidelity of submission to His Ordinances,[9] and for its part in the preservation of the faith, it may not appropriate and cannot carry the special responsibility committed to the Ministry. Each must answer in the measure of his own trust. Christ's stewards on the other hand may be subject to frequent and urgent temptation from the self-willed demands of the souls committed to their pastorate. But no pressure or demand can relieve Christ's stewards from their trust, and no desire to conciliate can excuse them if they show

[1] *Comm. on Mal.* i. 10.
[2] Ibid., ii. 9; cf. also *on Mal.* ii. 5, iii. 7, 8.
[3] 1 Cor. iv. 1, 2; Titus i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 10. [4] 2 Cor. v. 19.
[5] 1 Cor. iv. 1. [6] Acts xx. 28. [7] Luke xii. 42–48, xvi. 2; Heb. xiii. 17.
[8] John x. 4, 5. [9] Heb. xiii. 17.

themselves tolerant of pressure or plastic to the spirit of worldliness or unbelief or of impatience in the Church.[1] Men require of a steward that he be found faithful. The Ministry stands or falls, not to the flock, but to its Chief Shepherd. The ministers of Christ must hold the faith of the Gospel as it was delivered to them. They must assert the Christian standard of morality in face of the world's restlessness under Christ's prohibitions. They must keep the Sacraments intact as instituted. They are the guardians of doctrine,[2] of marriage, of the family, of the Church's discipline. And they must fulfil the Ministry which they have received, not counting life dear unto them.[3]

ORDERS OF MINISTRY

The Standards of the Church of Scotland find in the New Testament mention of two types of Ministry, and distinguish them as ordinary and extraordinary.[4] Among the *extraordinary* are reckoned Apostles, Evangelists, and Prophets; and these are said to have ceased.[5]

[1] Neither are they excused if they have allowed themselves to be made incapable under constitutional forms of discharging their trust effectively. They have always the remedy of which the prophet reminds them (Mal. i. 10, R.V.).

[2] The distinctive, although not (p. 78) the only, guardians. In the Church of Scotland some Presbyters are set apart as *Teachers* or *Doctors*, who have as part of their office not only to teach sacred doctrine but to guard its purity in the Church (*Presbyterial Form of Church Govt.*: 'Teacher or Doctor'). Judicial authority in the guardianship of doctrine is held and exercised only by Presbytery, Synod and General Assembly.

[3] Acts xx. 24.

[4] *Form of Church Govt.*: 'Of the Officers of the Church.' The same distinction can be made by Roman theology; cf. M. Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik*, IV. i. p. 573.

[5] The commonplace of our divines on this subject has been that in a settled or reformed Church which possesses the regular ministry the extraordinary has no place and cannot be looked for. They, however, always recognized that God might raise up extraordinary ministry of this kind as the situation might require it. Thus Calvin wrote to the King of Poland in 1554: 'Because, by the tyranny of the Pope, the continuous line of ordination has been broken, a new expedient for the restoration is required . . . But God Himself brings the remedy in raising up fitting and upright teachers to build up the Church, now lying deformed among the ruins of popery. And this office which the Lord laid upon us, when He made use of our services in collecting Churches, is one that is altogether anomalous.' It was on this ground that Richard Hooker acknowledged the ministry which was raised up during the course of the Reformation, apart from the *ordinary* succession. 'Men may be extraordinarily, yet allowably, two ways admitted into spiritual functions in the Church. One is when God Himself doth of Himself raise up any whose labour He useth without requiring that men should authorise them. Another extraordinary kind of vocation is, when the exigence of necessity doth constrain to leave the usual ways of the Church, which otherwise we could willingly keep: where the Church must needs have some ordained, neither hath, nor can have possibly a bishop to ordain; in case of

The ordinary Ministry is that which was constituted by the Apostles, and planted in the Churches which they founded.

In the Church of Scotland, as in Reformed Churches generally, *the ordinary Ministry* was of two kinds, (1) Presbyters or Bishops who laboured in the Word, dispensing the ordinances, and (2) Elders or Deacons who assisted the Ministry of Word and Sacrament 'in seeking the fruit of the same in the people'.[1] (1) Both 'Presbyter' and 'Bishop' are names applying to the same order, the essential ministry of Word and Sacrament, but a difference of application clung to the two names from the start. 'Presbyter' was the name given to ministers in Jewish-Christian Churches, and is found in the Churches established by Paul in his first missionary journey in accordance with the Jerusalem tradition.[2] 'Bishop' or 'Episcopos', however, is the name given to these ministers in Gentile churches, and is found accordingly in the churches established by Paul in his subsequent missionary journeys. The Pastoral letters appear to represent a stage where these two traditions are being brought together.[3] On the other hand, the term 'Presbyter' came to denote status rather than function, and was used as the general title of the office; whereas 'Bishop' was predicative or descriptive of function rather than rank or technical office.[4] (2) Both 'Elder' and 'Deacon' are names applying to the same kind of ministry, i.e. an assistant or diaconal ministry.[5] A corresponding difference obtained between these to

[1] *Second Book of Discipline*, viii; A. Henderson, *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, v, vi.

[2] See A. Ehrhardt, *The Apostolic Ministry*, p. 12; T. M. Lindsay, *Church and Ministry*, p. 118.

[3] The account given in Acts xx which uses both 'Presbyters' and 'Bishops' of the Church at Ephesus is one of the 'We' passages in the Acts. 'Presbyter' is the word used by the narrator, but 'Bishop' by St. Paul; cf. Phil. i. 1, where Paul mentions only 'Bishops' and 'Deacons' in Philippi.

[4] See Donald Macleod, *Ministry and Sacraments of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 96–8; J. Armitage Robinson, *Early History of Church and Ministry*, pp. 83, 84; and G. W. H. Lampe, *Some Aspects of the New Testament Ministry*, p. 17.

[5] cf. *The Collections* of W. Steuart of Pardovan, VI. 2: 'Though the office of Deacon is included in the office of a Ruling Elder, yet it is fit that some be appointed Deacons, distinct from that of the Elder.'

---

necessity, the ordinary institution of God hath given often times, and may give, place. And therefore we are not simply without exception to urge a lineal descent of power from the Apostles by continued successions of bishops in any effectual ordination' (*Of the Laws of Eccl. Polity*, VII. xiv. 11). See also Patrick Forbes, *Defence of the Lawful calling of the Ministry of Reformed Churches;* and Mason, *The Church of England and Episcopacy*, pp. 153, 185, 265, 268f. Precisely the same doctrine was applied by George Gillespie in insisting on the necessity of regular ordinations, *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions*, 1649, pp. 63f.

that which obtained between 'Presbyter' and 'Bishop'. Thus 'Elder' or 'Presbyter' was associated with the 'Presbyter' who laboured in the Word, whereas 'Deacon' was associated with the 'Bishop'. The relation between 'Elder' and 'Deacon' is seen in the appointment of 'the Seven' in the Acts after the analogy of 'the Seven [Elders] of a city' in Jewish Communities, but this function is described in Greek as deaconing.[1] The Reformed Church has always recognized, therefore, two kinds of 'Presbyters' in the early church, 'Teaching Elders' and 'Ruling Elders' as they are called in modern times.[2] As distinct from 'Elders' Deacons were the assistants of Bishops or Presbyters in their duties generally and especially in care of the poor and necessitous.

It appears probable that in the first age local churches were normally ruled by a college or council of 'Presbyter-Bishops', who exercised a joint authority, acting corporately in matters of common interest (as of government and discipline), and allocating among themselves other duties of ministration:[3] and that behind and with them stood the Apostolic Ministry, representing the general authority in the churches, and its delegations representing the link between the local Presbyteries and the Apostolate (Timothy, Titus, &c.) There is no doubt that a presidency existed within these local councils of Presbyters, as there existed in the Presbytery of Jerusalem which was permanently presided over by James.[4] In the pre-Christian and in contemporary communities outside the Church there were signal examples of such presidency. The *Gerousia* or community council had its *Gerousiarches*; the local Presbytery or eldership in the synagogue had its *Archisynagogos*

[1] Acts vi. According to the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin*, i. 6), a community of 120 men was entitled to elect its local *sanhedrin* of seven elders. cf. Acts i. 15. See D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 237f.; T. M. Lindsay, *The Church and the Ministry*, p. 115.

[2] See Calvin, *Inst.*, IV. iv. 2, IV. xi. 1, 6. Calvin cites the comment of Ambrose *In 1 Tim.*, v: 'The ancient synagogue, and afterwards the Church, had elders, without whose advice nothing was done: this has grown obsolete, by whose fault I know not, unless it be by the sloth, or rather the pride, of teachers, who would have it seen that they are somewhat.' What actually happened was that 'Deacon' absorbed into it the second kind of 'Presbyter' or 'Elder'. Only at the Reformation was 'Elder' revived.

[3] T. M. Lindsay, op. cit., p. 154; G. Dix, in *The Apostolic Ministry* (ed. K. E. Kirk), p. 293; Gore, *Church and Ministry*, pp. 220–1, 224; Rom. xii. 8; 1 Thess. v. 12; Heb. xiii. 7.

[4] This *Presbytery* is distinct from the *Apostolate* at any rate after the stage described in Acts xii. 17. See the *Presbyterial Form of Church Government*, 'Of Classical Assemblies': 'The Church of Jerusalem consisted of many particular congregations under one presbyterial government.'

or ruler of the synagogue,[1] the Covenant communities of Qumran and Damascus had their *Paqid* or overseer, the Hebrew equivalent for the Greek *Episcopos* or Bishop.[2] It is very probable that the last named had a decisive influence in the development of the Christian Church. Where the Churches were called Synagogues, the president or presidents of the local council of elders could be called the 'Ruler of the Synagogue',[3] but not when the rift with Judaism grew wider and the churches were called *Ecclesiai*; some other description had to be found. Here it would be natural to turn to the official names in the Gentile Churches, and here the Hebrew *Paqid*=*Episcopos* would facilitate the general adoption of *Episcopos* in place of *Archisynagogos* to describe the presiding Presbyter, but the term 'Presbyter' remained as it also had a usage in the Gentile world. Whatever be the actual name used at the time it is clear from the writings of the New Testament that the Church had its leaders and presidents to preside over the public worship and over the pastoral care of the congregations and communities—the *poimenes*, *hegoumenoi*, and the *proestamenoi*—especially to preside over the celebration of the Lord's Supper.[4] It would be difficult to conclude that these pastoral or liturgical leaders were different from those who presided over the councils of Presbyters, namely the Presbyter-Bishops.

There is still another important factor to be taken into account in determining the form for the ministry in the period covered by the New Testament writings—namely, the ministry of men like Timothy and Titus who certainly did not preside over single congregations or over several in one city like James at Jerusalem, but who were rather like missionary-bishops founding local churches and presbyteries over a wide area, in the case of Timothy in Asia Minor based on Ephesus, and in the case of Titus in Crete. On the other hand, it is precisely here in the Pastoral letters that

[1] T. M. Lindsay, op. cit., p. 130.

[2] *Manual of Discipline*, VI. 14. An equivalent term used is *mebaqqer*, VI. 12; *Zadokite Fragments*, X. 10; cf. the comments of Brownlee, Charles, Jeremias and Rabin, *ad loc. cit.* In the LXX *episcopos*, *episcope*, *episceptein*, *episcopein*, &c. are used to translate words from the roots *pqd* and *bqr*; cf. Acts i. 19 and Ps. lxix. 25.

[3] This continued to be the practice in some Jewish Christian Churches for many generations; Epiphanius, *Haer.* XXX. 18. See Jas. ii. 2. Sometimes a synagogue had more than one *Archisynagogos*, Mark v. 22; Acts xiii. 15; and it is not unlikely that the council of elders in some Christian Churches had more than one president.

[4] See T. M. Lindsay, op. cit., pp. 123, 150f., 160f.

we see the place of the Presbyters (both kinds) in the ministry[1] and see that ordination is regarded both as 'the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery'[2] and as imparting a spiritual gift for the ministry.[3]

The New Testament does not provide us with a picture of a fixed or a final pattern of the ministry, for it describes the initial period of growth and living formation; but on the other hand it points to the coalescing of what in later terms can be described as both presbyterial and episcopal elements. Immediately after New Testament times the picture becomes clearer; and although there is still variety and change, a basic pattern emerges of Presbyter-Bishops presiding over councils of Presbyters and Deacons. One thing does appear, as T. M. Lindsay described it:[4]

> We can say negatively that the change from one to the other did not come by any sudden alteration which gave rise to contentions; there is no word of such contentions in the whole round of Christian literature:[5] the change came naturally, so naturally as to make it seem that there was no change. We can say positively that there is great likelihood that the channel of the change was the relation of the officials to the conduct of the public worship, and more especially in their relation to the Eucharist. What happened there while a college of 'Presbyter-Bishops' was at the head of a congregation we do not know; but it is manifest that there could not be a collegiate superintendence of the Lord's Supper. Did the 'Presbyter-Bishops' take it in turn to officiate, or was one of their number appointed to undertake this service usually? We do not know. But it did become the duty of one man to superintend the administration of the Eucharist; we see this in Justin Martyr; and the man whom Justin calls the προεστώς[6] is plainly the forerunner of the single *episcopos*.

From a very early date there are significant indications in the Eastern Churches (Palestine, Syria, Proconsular Asia) of the practice of assigning to one person a definite and permanent precedence, with oversight of both ministry and flock; and to him

[1] 1 Tim. v. 17f.; Titus i. 5. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 14. [3] Ibid.

[4] *The Church and Ministry*, pp. 376f.

[5] This is too sweeping a statement. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians implies some contention, for he urges them to unite in the outward ordering of their Christian life in agreement with the Mind of Christ. Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* also indicates contention over the ministry which recalls the same language used by Paul to the Corinthians against 'strife', 'jealousy', &c.

[6] *Proestôs*—the term used to describe the presbyter who laboured in the word in 1 Tim. v. 17.

the alternative title Bishop (that is, overseer) came in such cases to be limited.

The development took place in churches founded by St. Paul himself within forty years after his martyrdom, in the areas that had seen the labours of Timothy and experienced the direct influence of St. John; and this fact has suggested that it had his sanction or even was due to his initiation. Ignatius, St. John's junior contemporary (martyred *c.* A.D. 107), was such a Bishop of the Church in Antioch; and in those of his letters which were written (immediately before his death) to Churches in Asia Minor, he makes it evident that similar officials existed in them as well. The vigour of his appeals for recognition of their authority suggests, however, that even in these Churches their office was recent and required commendation.[1] In the account of the ministry these epistles provide, it is the presbytery (or *sanhedrin*) that corresponds to the Apostles, while the Bishop presiding at the Eucharist represents Christ, but so do the deacons, for their ministry reflects the humble 'deaconing' of Christ the Servant of the Lord.[2]

It is from the same area that there derives the early material embedded in the Clementine literature which describes the Bishop with his twelve Presbyters and four or more deacons,[3] and from the same area that have come most of the early service books such as the *Didache*, *Didascalia*, *Testamentum Domini*, &c., all of which show the same general development.

In the West, on the other hand, and in Egypt, the Presbyteral Colleges continued for much longer to exercise the full oversight and to discharge the entire office of the Ministry.[4] 'It is not too

[1] It is increasingly recognized that Ignatius wrote as he did, not in the interest of monepiscopacy, but in the interest of unity and order. The same motives are apparent in St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians and in Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians*.

[2] *Ad. Eph.*, 2. 2; 4. 1; *Ad Magn.*, 3. 1; 6. 1; 7. 1; *Ad Trall.*, 2. 1–3; 3. 1; 7. 2; *Ad Phil.*, Int.; 4. 1; 5. 1; 7. 1; 8. 1; 10. 2; *Ad Smyrn.*, 8. 1, 2; 9. 1; 10. 1; 12. 2; *Ad Poly.* 6. 1.

[3] *Clem. Recog.*, III. 66; VI. 15; *Hom.*, XI. 36.

[4] cf. the conclusions of E. W. Kemp after examining the evidence for the Presbyteral consecration of Bishops at Alexandria up to the Council of Nicaea: 'It appears that such evidence as we have that the mode of appointment of the early bishops of Alexandria was unusual is also evidence that there was a carefully regulated succession, albeit a succession through a presbyteral college . . . It is more than doubtful whether the Alexandrian use offers any guidance to the church in the reunion problems of the present day except perhaps in emphasizing that the principle of apostolic succession is compatible with a presbyterian constitution.' (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1955, vol. vi, p. 142.)

much to say that in the subapostolic age we can prove the non-existence of the monarchical Episcopate in the great Apostolic Churches of Corinth and Rome, and in the equally great and famous Church of Alexandria, and in the Apostolic though less famous Church of Philippi.'[1] At Rome, for example, there is apparently no Bishop (in the Ignatian sense) known to Clement (A.D. 96); or to Ignatius (*c.* A.D. 107), or to the author of the *Shepherd of Hermas* (*c.* A.D. 140).[2] 'Bishops and teachers and deacons' are mentioned, 'leaders of the church who take the chief seats',[3] &c., which reminds us of Catacomb paintings of Eucharistic celebrations in which almost invariably seven presbyters sit behind the Holy Table in a semi-circle, like a synagogue *sanhedrin* of elders, with its president in the centre.[4]

Monepiscopacy in Rome has its earliest clear account in *The Apostolic Tradition* (*c.* A.D. 217) of Hippolytus.[5] Although it is the work of a schismatic Bishop obviously interested in embellishing and justifying his episcopal status it does give us invaluable insight into the development early in the third century. Here the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons correspond in their way to the status of the High Priest, Priests, and Levites of the Old Testament.[6] Although the Bishop is not of a different order from his Presbyters, he is monarchical in status, while the second kind of Eldership whose loss Ambrose deplored in the following century has been absorbed into the Diaconate, or into the Presbyterate.[7]

By the middle of the third century a monarchical Episcopate had become general in both East and West. But in the West (and

[1] J. Cooper, *Pentecostal Gift*, p. 187. As to Corinth, compare Gwatkin, *Dict. of Bible*, i, p. 301; Gore, *Church and Ministry*, p. 284.

[2] 'The beginning of the change dates from the time of Pius' (A.D. 140–63), and was incomplete for several generations later. John Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 127.

[3] *The Shepherd*, II. 4. 1; III. 5. 1; III. 9. 7; cf. III. 1. 8; IX. 25. 2; 26. 2, cf. 27. 2.

[4] See J. Wilpert, *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* (1903), Taf. 15, 27, 41, &c.

[5] Irenaeus of Lyons, the teacher of Hippolytus, seems to have been a missionary Presbyter-Bishop like Timothy or Titus. There is no evidence that he was given episcopal consecration or even knew of a succession of consecrations, while in his writings the succession of Bishops is regarded as the same as the succession of Presbyters. *Adv. Haer.*, iii. 2. 2; 3. 2; iv. 26. 2, &c. See the article on Irenaeus and the Apostolic succession by Einar Molland, *Journal of Eccl. History*, 1950, vol. i, pp. 12ff.

[6] *The Apostolic Tradition*, I. iii. 4; viii. 1; ix. 2, 3.

[7] While the Presbyters are related to the O.T. Priests, they are also related to the Elders of Israel appointed by Moses: viii. 3. Hence the idea that the Presbyters form the Christian *sanhedrin*, found in Ignatius and Hermas, is continued and is found fully developed in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, ii. 25–38.

parts of the East—Egypt, Armenia) a constant tradition continued, and has never been lost, that Presbyter and Bishop are degrees of one and the same order, and that the distinction between the two offices is of ecclesiastical creation, being a matter of regulation and not of Divine ordinance.

It is thus accurate to say[1] that the Monarchical Episcopate 'existed from the times of the Apostles'—or at least from the time of an Apostle—in the sense that 'in parts of the Church' it existed from within the lifetime of St. John. It is also certain that 'in some other parts, especially at Rome and Alexandria, there were at first only two orders'.[2] Since, then, the apostolicity and sufficiency of such Churches as, for example, those of Rome and Alexandria, Corinth and Philippi, are unquestioned,[3] it follows that government and ministry such as these Churches had, is apostolic, valid, lawful and sufficient. It seems to follow, also, that there exist only two *orders* of Ministry—those namely of Presbyter or Bishop and Elder or Deacon, and that the Episcopate, as distinguished from the Presbyterate, is not a Divine Ordinance, or order,[4] but is

[1] John Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 142. [2] Ibid.

[3] In this respect the Council of Nicaea established a very important principle, when, while enacting by its Fourth Canon that for the sake of good order the consecration of Bishops in the future required the presence of other Bishops, it recognized the Egyptian Bishops in the Council although they only had Presbyteral consecration. 'At the time of Nicaea, no one seems to have thought of such a defect as having any substance. The emphasis laid by the Fourth Canon on numerous episcopal consecrators, and so upon the imposition of episcopal hands, appears as something new, aimed at the removal of abuses rather than the suppression of the regular procedure. No one required what is now called "interconsecration" to regularize the position of the Egyptians. In the days of Nicaea, the keystone of apostolic ministry was not held to be a particular rite for the making of a Bishop. There was no general belief that valid episcopal succession was inseparable from an unbroken chain of laying on of hands. The tradition of a faith and life was the end upon which ecclesiastical rule was bent.' (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1952, vol. iii, p. 12.)

[4] cf. J. Calvin: 'In each city the presbyters selected one of their members to whom they gave the special title *Bishop*, lest, as usually happens, from equality dissensions should arise. The Bishop, however, was not so superior in honour and dignity as to have dominion over his colleagues, but as it belongs to a president in an assembly to bring matters before them, collect their opinions, take precedence of others in consulting, advising, exhorting, guide the whole procedure by his authority, and execute what is decreed by common consent, a Bishop held the same office in a meeting of Presbyters' (*Inst.*, IV. iv. 2). 'Each Presbyter, merely to preserve order and peace, was under one Bishop, who, though he excelled others in dignity, was subject to the meeting of his brethren' (ibid.). 'Presbyters and deacons were ordained by the laying on of hands; but each bishop, with the college of Presbyters, ordained his own Presbyters. But although they all did the same act, yet because the Bishop presided, and the ordination was performed as it were under his auspices, it was said to be his. Hence ancient writers often say that a Presbyter does not differ in any respect from a Bishop except in not having the power of ordaining.' (*Inst.*, IV. iv. 15.)

an office—almost certainly *sanctioned* by St. John, probably approved by him, for its purpose in those localities for which he may have been more directly responsible. The office therefore possesses a very high prescription and commendation; yet possesses no such prescription as to demand its adoption (as apostolically imposed) by the Church generally, either in St. John's own day or later; since such capital Churches as those of Rome and Alexandria continued to be without it—a thing impossible in the case of a Divine or Apostolic Ordinance.[1]

Episcopate in this (the Ignatian or monarchical) sense is therefore not an ordinance, but an institution. It is a development within the presbyterate and from the presbyterate. It 'arose'—there was a time when it was not. But all things needful to the being of the Church have been from the beginning.[2] As an *order* the Presbyterate seems to be the highest 'ordinary' or perpetual ministry, and to be properly the Ministry fundamental and essential and sufficient to furnish from within its commission (whether by selection from its own ranks or by collegiating from its membership) whatever further institutional equipment may be for the Church's fuller welfare.

The process of the development of the episcopate appears to have been one of delegation—or perhaps rather of the restriction—to a single Presbyter, representing the general body of the Presbyterate, of the exercise of functions which had resided in

[1] *Ministry of Grace*, p. 121. See also Turner, *Cambridge Med. Hist.*, ch. vi, and Rawlinson, in *Foundations*, ch. viii.

[2] Bp. Gore, *Church and Ministry*, p. 54, ed. 1919, indicates with much cogency that the principle of 'essential finality' expressed in the faith once for all delivered, the Spirit once for all sent forth, the society once for all instituted, suggests the analogy of 'a once for all empowered and commissioned ministry'. The Presbyterate would appear to be the only ministry answering to the requirement—the Episcopate, it seems to be generally admitted, 'arose'. Hence the attempt by some modern Anglicans to read back the invention of Theodoret, that Bishops succeeded to the place of the Apostles, into earlier centuries and even into the New Testament itself: cf. K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry*. This is to ignore the teaching of the earliest *Church Orders*, that it is Presbyters who are *in loco apostolorum*. Cf. *The Apostolic Constitutions* (II. 26): 'Let the Presbyters be esteemed by you to represent us the Apostles', and (II. 28): 'Let also a double portion be set apart for the Presbyters, as for such who labour continually in the Word and Doctrine, upon the account of the Apostles, whose place they sustain, as the counsellors of the Bishop, and the crown of the Church. For they are the sanhedrin and Senate of the Church.' Cf. St. Peter's claim to be co-Presbyter with the Presbyters whom he addresses (1 Pet. v. 1), and of the description of the occupants of the Heavenly seats as Presbyters (Rev. iv. 4, 10).

presbyteral councils.[1] The ministry acted through him—he acted in name of the ministry. He thus became the recognized *persona* of the local Church and its clergy. In his presence eventually no other Presbyter exercised office, unless as his assistant or substitute.[2] He offered the gifts: he celebrated the Eucharist: he blessed: he preached: he baptized: he confirmed: he took the leading part in ordination; only by his commission would another Presbyter do any of these things. With his commission another Presbyter might do and did them all:[3] any presbyter was, in right of *order*, as competent as the Bishop for each of these acts—although for regularity, 'by custom' and by consent, without his authority a Presbyter might not perform them. In process of time commission to confirm or ordain became rarer, and ultimately ceased to be given;[4] commission to preach, baptize, celebrate, &c.,

[1] Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, p. 121 (2nd edit.). A clear example of this is found in Irenaeus of Lugdunum, to whom the doctrine of Apostolic Succession owes its origin. As E. Molland has described it: 'The situation at Lugdunum seems to have been as follows. The episcopal office was "monarchical". The title *episkopos* was reserved for the president of the presbytery. *Episkopos* and *presbyteros* were not synonymous. The bishop was bishop for his lifetime and held a far more authoritative position than the presbyter. None the less Irenaeus seems to have been consecrated bishop by his fellow-presbyters' (*Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1950, vol. i, p. 28). The theory that Irenaeus was consecrated Bishop when in Rome does not now seem tenable. See F. Vernet, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, VII. 2, 2,395.

[2] Wordsworth, *op. cit.* p. 156. Cf. a description of, apparently, just such a state of affairs among the presbyters, nine in number, who served in the church of the ascetics at Nitria in the fourth century: Palladius, *Lausiac History*, vii. 5.

[3] Such, at least, was the Western tradition. Hence when Order was conceived as *seven* Orders, the seventh and highest Order was the Presbyterate. The Bishop is in Order a Presbyter, but he has supreme jurisdiction and status. This was the teaching of Thomas Aquinas and was finally defined at the Council of Trent. The idea that the Bishop belongs to a still higher Order, the eighth, was an error or deviation introduced into the Western tradition by Duns Scotus. See *Royal Priesthood*, pp. 77f.

[4] There does not seem to be ground for the belief current elsewhere that Confirmation and Ordination are, in some sense in which other ministerial functions are not, inherently and by the nature of the office peculiar to the Episcopate. As matter of fact, in the small communities in which the office was originally exercised, *all* functions seem to have been equally reserved to the Bishop when and where he could personally discharge them, and to have been discharged by other Presbyters when and where the Bishop was absent; and this seems to have been as true of Preaching, of Baptism, or of celebration of the Eucharist, as of Confirmation or Ordination. To celebrate was indeed considered to be 'the Bishop's most important function' (Gore, *Church and Ministry*, p. 138n.); to preach was his right, and in his presence the Presbyter might not preach (Jer. *Ep. iii ad Evagrium*, quoted by Gore). Only the consecration of a Bishop *required* the presence of Bishops—that is after the *Council of Nicaea* which ruled (Can. IV) that at least three Bishops must assemble for the consecration. (Before this Bishops appear to have been consecrated by Presbyters in Alexandria, Antioch, Rome and Lyons; cf. Mgr. Duchesne, *Histoire Ancienne de l'Église*, 3rd edit. p. 94.) In the East, Confirmation is

on the other hand continued and extended; with the extension of Christianity, and ultimately with the development of the parochial system, it came to be customarily granted with any pastoral charge, but the Bishop's commission, whether in the form of licence or of induction, remains under the Episcopal system as necessary as ever it was.

It seems, then, that the Episcopal office is formed not so much 'by elevation out of the presbyterate' as by restriction of other Presbyters. Under the monarchical system the 'Bishop' is a Presbyter who continues to exercise the full function of his order;[1] the 'Presbyter' is a Presbyter who, in the interests of order and of episcopal government, is canonically and customarily restrained from exercising his function except when and in so far as the Bishop requires his assistance. Canon and custom make the Presbyter in the East the ordinary minister of Baptism and of Confirmation, but not of Ordination; in the West they make him the ordinary minister of Baptism but not of Confirmation—and of Ordination only in conjunction with the Bishop.[2] In either case, however, the restrictions are restrictions upon the exercise of functions which are, and which (since the order is divinely created) remain, inherent in his order. Such restrictions are only regulative—they cannot denude of capacity for what God has given.

At the Reformation the clear and settled intention of the Reformers generally was to revert to primitive forms of Christian Institution, as discoverable within Scripture and as scripturally warranted. Applying this principle to the Ministry, they were necessarily thrown back upon the presbyterate as it existed before the power of ordination came to be restricted normally to the Bishop. At that point they found it (as modern historical criticism

[1] cf. Wordsworth, *Ministry of Grace*, pp. 125–41.

[2] Anglican *Ordinal*, 'The Bishop with the priests present shall lay their hands severally', &c.

---

ministered by the Presbyter as freely as is Baptism—to allege the use in it of Chrism obtained from the Bishop as an invocation of the Bishop to confirm, would make unction of the sick also an Episcopal and not a Presbyteral function. The reservation of Ordination, however, to the Bishop as guardian of unity would tend to follow his office whenever his office appeared: and when established would be more jealously guarded and less readily delegated—for the same reasons which cause Ordination under the Presbyterian system to be rigidly reserved to the Presbytery. The impression that this function at least was distinctive of the Bishop's office, and that, in respect at least of the right to ordain, he differed characteristically from other Presbyters, rapidly gained currency and is often met with.

finds it) the essential and fundamental Ministry, containing in itself all functions and exercising them in right of *order*. The Reformers had been trained in the general tradition of the Western Church that Episcopate and Presbyterate are only degrees of one order:[1] that Ordination to the presbyterate is the grace-conferring sacrament which consecration to the episcopate is not: that the Bishop is, in order, no more than a Presbyter entrusted by the Church with a duty of representation and superintendence; and that the limitations imposed on other Presbyters are only canonical. The Presbyterate remained in its essential nature what it was as apostolically given, indefeasibly retaining the character and powers impressed upon it at its creation. The guiding principle of the Reformers was that deviations were to be set aside, and Scriptural discipline restored as at the first. As regards Ministry this meant that the presbyterate should be restored to its primitive position.[2]

We do not find at the Reformation, or for some time afterwards, any hostility to Episcopacy as a form of government.[3] We find only a resolve to reclaim for the Presbyterate recognition of its fundamental character, and to deny to the Episcopate any *divinely given* right to absorb the functions of the Presbyterate, or to be reckoned alone essential. Thus the Reformed Church insists that the order of the Presbyterate is in the strict sense the only order of

[1] The traditional teaching is clearly stated by Morinus in his work, *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, 1665, III, p. 30: *episcopi et presbyteri una ordinatio est*. It was only after the work of Morinus was published that another view really gained ground, namely, that there were three orders (Bishop, Presbyter and Deacon), but this view cannot legitimately be read back into Reformation or pre-Reformation times in the West. See J. M. Barkley, 'The Meaning of Ordination', in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 1956, vol. ix, pp. 135–60. But cp. *Anglican Ordinal*, 1552 *et seq*. See also Appendix R.

[2] Hence Calvin wrote in his *Epistle to Cardinal Sadoleto*: 'We have not the least objection that the discipline that was sanctioned by the ancient canons should be in force in the present day, and be carefully observed; nay, we have always protested that the miserable condition into which the Church had fallen was owing to nothing more than its enervation by luxury and indulgence. For the Body of the Church, to cohere well, must be bound together by discipline as well as with sinews. For how, on your part, is discipline either observed or desired? Where are those ancient canons with which, like a bridle, Bishops and Presbyters were kept to their duty?'

[3] See e.g. Knox's letter to the Assembly of 1572; Calvin, *Letter to King of Poland*, 1554. Again Calvin wrote in his treatise on *The Necessity of Reforming the Church* the following challenge: 'Let them show us a hierarchy in which bishops are distinguished, but not for refusing to be subject to Christ, in which they depend upon Him as the only Head, and act solely with reference to Him, in which they cultivate entirely fellowship with each other, bound together by no other tie than His truth; then, indeed, I will confess that there is no anathema too strong for those who do not regard them with reverence, and yield them the fullest obedience.'

the ministry.[1] This is the real meaning of the so-called parity of ministers in the Church of Scotland, but this does not preclude distinctions in jurisdiction either in the Church Courts to which Presbyters are subject or among Presbyters themselves.

Under this common principle the Reformation pursued different courses in different countries. In the Scandinavian countries and in England the Episcopate was continued, but in the former at least with clear recognition of its dependence on ecclesiastical institution. In the Reformed Church of Hungary, the largest Presbyterian church in Europe, Bishops were retained within the Presbyterian system. In some Lutheran countries and in Scotland, Superintendents (analogous to the Bishop of the sub-apostolic age) were substituted.[2] In France, Switzerland, and parts of Germany, the primitive Council of Presbyters was revived. These were varying applications of one doctrine of ministry: namely, that the Presbyterate is the highest Order of Ministry and is constituted the Stewardship of the mysteries of God in Word and Sacrament. In reviving and asserting this doctrine, the Reformers proceeded precisely as they did in restoring the chalice to the laity—not abolishing or changing anything which the Church has received from the Lord, but resting in the security of obedience to original and apostolic discipline. They 'placed the crown again' on the heads of those on whom the Apostles set it, that is, of the Presbyters.[3]

ORDINATION

Ordination is a solemn setting apart of a person to some public Church office.[4] It is manifest by the Word of God that no man ought to take upon him the office of a Minister of the Gospel

[1] See Appendix, p. 124.

[2] The nature of this ministry has never been better described than by Erskine of Dun, Superintendent of Angus and Mearns, in his letter to the Earl of Morton in 1572 (see Appendix M); Calderwood, *History*, vol. III, pp. 156ff. It is clear from this that the office of Superintendent was not designed as a temporary office in the Kirk, as is often averred: *Register of the Kirk Sessions of St. Andrews*, I. 75. See also John à Lasco, *Forma ac Ratio*, on which J. Knox based his order for the ordination (i.e. re-ordination) of the *Superintendent*; G. Donaldson, 'The Polity of the Scottish Church, 1560–1600', *Scottish Church History Society Record*, XI (pp. 212–26), p. 217n.; and G. Donaldson, W. Croft Dickinson and I. A. Milne, *Source Book of Scottish History*, vol. ii, 2nd edit. 1959, 'The Polity and Worship of the Reformed Church', pp. 207–13.

[3] 'Super Capita Sacerdotum, id est, Ministrorum Christi': Smeton, *Orthodoxa Responsio*, p. 6. (1579).

[4] *Form of Church Government*, 'Touching the Doctrine of Ordination'.

until he is lawfully called and ordained thereunto.[1] Ordination is always to be continued in the Church.[2] Every Minister of the Word is to be ordained by the imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting.[3]

The term Ordination is used indifferently of various offices as well as of the presbyterate; e.g. of the diaconate (both male and female), as well as of those orders which anciently were known as 'minor' (reader, doorkeeper, &c.). There is no necessary reason why it should not be applied to the making of an elder, his office being a 'church office', though, for avoidance of confusion, the term 'admission' may in that case be preferred, and has been used.[4]

In the same way the laying on of hands is a general symbol of benediction, of consecration, of the transmission of office, or of the bestowal of authority: as, for example, on penitents when reconciled, in confirmation of the baptized, on Deacons and (in the East) on Deaconesses, in consecration of Bishops—as well as in the ordination of Presbyters. Ordination is not a mechanical but a spiritual action, in which the effect of the act depends on the appointed end, which is indicated by the nature of the office in question, as well as by the words which accompany the action, whether in the form of prayer or of declaration. In the case of Ordination to an order of Ministry divinely instituted, the Divinely given end necessarily determines the nature of the act. Properly Ordination means ordination to the ministry of Word and Sacrament, which is strictly speaking the only Order in the Ministry.[5]

[1] *Form of Church Government*, 'Directory for the Ordination of Ministers'.

[2] Ibid., 'Concerning the doctrinal part of Ordination of Ministers'.

[3] Ibid.; cf. the *Second Helvetic Confession* (approved by the Church of Scotland in 1566): 'Let those who are elected be ordained by the presbyters with public prayers and laying on of hands'; and *The Second Book of Discipline*, III. 6: 'Ordination is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed to God and His Kirk, after he is well tried and found qualified. The ceremonies of Ordination are fasting, earnest prayer, and imposition of hands of the Eldership.' See Steuart of Pardovan, *Collections*, I. i. 24, 25, 26.

[4] This was the word used in the *Acts of Assembly*, 1582, Sess. 12, laying down the order for the election and admission of elders. The same form was used for the admission of Deacons. See also Alexander Henderson, *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, 1641, p. 30. 'Ordination and admission' is used in the Act of 1932, X.

[5] The medieval theologians taught that 'the Sacrament of Order is ordained in order to the Eucharist, which is the Sacrament of Sacraments' (cf. Thomas Aquinas, *Summ. Theol. Suppl.*, q. 27. 4. 2–3). Because for them the Sacrament

It has often been discussed whether (other conditions being present) the use of imposition of hands is necessary to Ministerial Ordination. The essence of Ordination on the external side being the orderly devolvement of commissioned responsibility and authorization—the sending by those who are sent—and the object of the accompanying rite being to make evident the bestowal of commission by the commissioned, it may be agreed that, so long as this intention is clear and is evidenced by word and act, the particular action employed for the purpose may be held indifferent.[1] The teaching of the Church of Scotland is that we are tied to the use of imposition of hands by Apostolic example and universal prescription.[2] 'The *ceremonies* of Ordination are fasting, earnest prayer, and the imposition of the hands of the Eldership.'[3]

THE MINISTERS OF ORDINATION

Every Minister of the Word is to be ordained by the imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong,[4] by those to whom the imposition of

[1] 'There is even no abstract necessity for ordination to take place through tactual laying on of hands at all. Laying on of hands must be regarded simply as the means used by the Church to show that she is making the appointment and bestowing the authority: some such "outward and visible sign" to mediate the commission is doubtless required, but not necessarily this particular sign.' (Rawlinson, *Foundations*, p. 399). The question is of importance only because so much more than need be has been made of the omission of imposition of hands, proposed in the *First Book of Discipline*. Rawlinson's position, above quoted, is substantially that of Calvin (*Inst.*, IV. xxxi, 6), and of George Gillespie (*Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland*, c. xiv), and presumably that of the authors of the *First Book of Discipline*, which is sufficiently emphatic as to the need of ordination, whether indicated by contact or by benediction.

[2] This was very powerfully argued by George Gillespie, *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions*, 1649, chs. IV and VIII.

[3] i.e. of the Presbyterate; *Second Book of Discipline*, iii. The Westminster standards revised the order to 'the imposition of hands and prayer' apparently laying comparatively more stress on judicial authorization than at the Reformation where the invocation of the Spirit upon the ordained was regarded as primary. Cf. Alexander Henderson, *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, 1641, II: 'According to the simplicity of the Apostolical and ancient church, [they] content themselves with fasting, prayer, and imposition of hands.'

[4] *Form of Church Government*, 'Touching the Doctrine of Ordination'.

---

of Order involved seven 'orders' all culminating in the seventh, it could be said of the other six that they were indirectly 'in order to the Eucharist', although only in the Presbyterate was there fulness of Order. For the Reformed Church ordination is 'in Order to Word and Sacrament', and strictly speaking 'ordination' is applicable only to those ordained to this end.

hands doth appertain.[1] It is requisite that Ministers be ordained by some who, being themselves set apart for the work of the Ministry, have power to join in the setting apart of others.[2]

The full teaching here [that is, of the *Form* of *Church Government* as a whole, as to 'Derivation of the Ministry'] *is that the Christian ministry derives not from the people but from the pastors, that a scriptural ordinance provides for this ministry being renewed through the ordination of presbyter by presbyters, that this ordinance draws its origin from the Apostles who were themselves presbyters, and that through them it passes to its source in Christ.*[3]

'The Church of Scotland allows no power in the people, but only in the Pastors of the Church, to appoint or ordain Church officers.'[4] 'Our Church doth condemn any doctrine that tends to support the people's power of ordaining their ministers.'[5] 'Ordination is the appointment of Jesus Christ, conveying a character by the instrumentality of the Office Bearers of the Church.' 'Against both' (i.e. both those who despise Ministry, and those who represent it 'as given by Christ to the people and transferred by them at their pleasure to those whom they choose') 'we presbyterians join with the Church of Rome and the Church of England in holding that the persons vested with Church government derive their powers not from the people, but from Jesus Christ by His Ministers.'[6]

[1] *Form of Church Government*, 10, 'Concerning the doctrinal part of Ordination of Ministers'. There must be at least three ministers co-operating in this act, ibid.

[2] Ibid., 'Special Rules'.

[3] *Report to the General Assembly of 1911 by Special Committee on the Petition of Rev. J. A. D. Macdonald.* General Assembly Reports for 1911, p. 1170. (Mr. Macdonald was a Wesleyan minister applying for recognition as ordained. The Committee recommended that the petition be not granted. Mr. Macdonald accordingly received Ordination from the Presbytery of Edinburgh.) See the Memorandum by Alexander Martin, *Presbyterian Orders and Admission of Ministers from Other Churches*, Church of Scotland Committee on Publications, Edinburgh, 1941, pp. 18f., 22f.

[4] *Act of Assembly*, 1698, vi. 3: 'Anent the calumny of Thomas Cripps, Rector of Bury, in a sermon preached by him.' See George Gillespie, *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions*, 1649, pp. 8f., 24f., 57f.

[5] Steuart of Pardovan, *Collections*, Book I. i. 21.

[6] Principal George Hill, *Lectures*. See ii. 2: 'While parts of the Apostolic office expired with the persons to whom it was committed by the Lord Jesus, the right of performing all the ministerial functions which were intended to be perpetuated in the Christian Church is conceived to be conveyed by the Act of Ordination, so that every person who is ordained is "as much a successor of the Apostles as any teacher of religion can be".' 'What Erskine's *Institutes* are to the Scotch Lawyer, Hill's *Lectures* are to the Scotch divine' (Cunningham, *Church Hist. of Scotland*, II. xxxviii).

The doctrine of succession as an element necessary to constitute 'lawful ministry'[1] is thus the doctrine of the Church of Scotland and of its standards. As Samuel Rutherford expressed it, 'The established and settled order of calling of pastors is by succession of pastor to pastor'.[2] It has been continuously taught in its Acts and confession, probably since 1560,[3] certainly since 1566, and has been asserted and maintained by its Divines in an uninterrupted tradition to the present day.[4] On the other hand, the Church of Scotland has been very conscious that ministerial succession cannot be abstracted from the living continuity of the whole Church as the redeemed people of God. In itself ministerial succession has no importance, it has importance only within the whole life and doctrine of the church. It is *this doctrine* of succession that has been so dear to the Church of Scotland.

Four main elements are to be distinguished in this doctrine.

[1] 'Lawful ministry' rather than 'valid ministry' has usually been the expression preferred by the Church of Scotland through its history since the Reformation. The word 'validity' carries confusion and ambiguity that dates from the Donatist controversy and is almost inevitably misleading. If Christ is Himself the principal Ordainer then 'lawfulness' must have a Christological reference—i.e. the 'validity' of order can only be established or verified by reference to Him, i.e. to justification by His Grace to be 'under law to Christ'. But because it is Christ acting in His Body, the Church on earth, 'lawfulness' must have an ecclesiological reference, i.e. 'validity' of order is also to be established or verified by reference to the Church. Ministry is truly 'lawful' only when the reference to the Church is subordinate to the primary reference to Christ, for the Church is not in control of Christ but serves Him alone, who rules over the Church and uses it as He will and as His instrument. See D. Paton, *Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism*, pp. 201f.

[2] Cited from T. Walker, *Scottish Theology and Theologians*, 2nd edit., 1888, p. 188. See also *Ius Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, 1654, I, p. 185; II, pp. 33, 45.

[3] See W. M. MacMillan, *The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church*, pp. 343f. When the *Scots Confession* 1560 (XVIII) and the *First Book of Discipline* insist that lineal descent (i.e. *perpetua successio episcoporum*) is not one of the marks of the true Church (i.e. the true preaching of the Word, the right administration of the Sacraments and Ecclesiastical discipline), they nevertheless require regular ordination by ministerial authority and agency (see the order for the ordination of Superintendents, *Book of Common Order*), while it is insisted that those who tamper with Christ's seals (the Sacraments) without authority, are 'even worthy of death'. What the Scottish Reformation repudiated was the idea that 'a political or ceremonial succession' (*Works of John Knox*, III, p. 480) was *in itself* enough to constitute Rome to be the true Church (see also *Works of John Knox*, VI, 697f.). Succession has a proper and legitimate place, but when it is made the *sine qua non* of the true Church, it has to be called in question as a perversion of the truth.

[4] In order to clear up any doubts about the matter the General Assembly enacted in 1597 that there should be 'a uniformity in the ordination of the ministry throughout the whole country, Imposition of hands' (Calderwood, *History of the Church of Scotland*, V, p. 642). An account of the doctrine of Ministerial Succession, as held in the Church of Scotland, will be found in *Reunion* (Gardner Hitt, Edinburgh, 1909), pp. 17–48.

First, a true ministerial succession is organically related to succession in doctrine, that is in doctrinal obedience to the teaching of the Apostles.[1] It belongs to the basic concept of succession that it is a succession ordered in accordance with the Apostolic doctrine; otherwise it is only a succession in disorder. This organic relation of doctrine and order belongs to the very essence of the Reformed Church. Calvin expressed it thus: 'Rule in the Church, the pastoral office, and all other matters of order, resemble the body, whereas the doctrine which regulates the due worship of God, and points out the ground on which the consciences of men must rest their hope of salvation, is the *soul* which animates the body, renders it lively and active, in short makes it, not to be a dead and useless carcase.'[2] Wherever there is a ministerial succession, however faultless it may be formally, it is nothing but an empty husk if it is divided from the faithful tradition of the Apostolic doctrine, because it is in reference to this doctrine that the ministerial succession has its sole place and justification.[3]

Second, a true ministerial succession is organically related to the Word which is ministered. This means that we cannot think of the ministry as a self-perpetuating succession, but as continuously dependent upon the Word it serves, for it is from the Word that it draws its strength, out of the Word that it lives, and by the Word that it is itself ordered. It was an oral setting and the oral tradition of the Word before the New Testament was written down which ordered the Church and instituted and shaped the ministry, and built it upon the Apostolic foundation in Christ. It is still that prophetic and creative Word, uttered with all its dominical and apostolic authority, that governs the Church and orders its mission and it is only by serving that Word that the ministry has its *raison d'être* in history and therefore it is only in that organic relation to it that it is anything at all. Therefore the emphasis is to be laid not upon the ministers in their succession but upon the objective and living Word who Himself presides as Lord wherever His Word is faithfully proclaimed, and who uses that proclaimed Word as the sceptre whereby He orders His

[1] cf. J. L. Ainslie, *The Doctrine of Ministerial Order in the Reformed Churches of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1940, p. 228.

[2] *The Necessity of Reforming the Church*, *Tracts*, I, pp. 126f.; see *The Second Book of Discipline*, I. 1–7.

[3] cf. Lord Balfour of Burleigh (*Presbyterianism in Scotland*, p. 44): 'There is in the Scottish Presbyterian Churches a *perpetua successio presbyterorum* from before the Reformation. But its value to the first Reformers was nil.'

Church throughout all its historical life and gives it its appointed place within His Kingdom.

Third, a true ministerial succession is organically related to the whole continuity of the redeemed life of the people of God. In other words, ministerial succession has its place only within the basic continuity of the Church as the Body of Christ on earth and in history. Here the focus of attention is to be directed to Holy Baptism as the sacrament of incorporation into Christ, and as the Sacrament setting forth the fundamental union and communion of every member of the Body of Christ. It is precisely because Baptism is the great sacrament of living union with and in Christ, that it provides the sacramental basis for the continuity of the Church in all its life and mission through the ages, and therefore also for the continuing of the ministry within that unity of the One Body.

Fourth, a true ministerial succession is organically related to the continuous fellowship in the mystery of Christ which He freely grants in His grace. Here the focus of attention is upon the Lord's Supper as the Sacrament in which we are ever granted renewal in the New Covenant of the Body and Blood of Christ. The Church celebrates the Eucharist in the ordered continuity of its worship and life, and it is celebrated in the Church by a ministry duly authorized in the orderly devolvement of responsibility within the sphere of the Apostolic mission and commission, but as often as the Church celebrates Holy Communion it acknowledges that it is not upon the faithfulness of the ministry or upon its unbroken succession that it depends, but solely upon the Covenant mercies of Christ which He renews to us in that Sacrament. In other words the Church relies at no point upon its own obedience, but upon the *promise* of Christ to be with her, to maintain and uphold her, to forgive and cleanse her, and in spite of all her failures and lapses and omissions to gather her within His everlasting Covenant to which He is unfailingly faithful. The Church is essentially a Church in Covenant with Christ, and the ministry belongs to His Covenant mercies. That is why the Church of Scotland has always sought to find its justification not in its own orders or succession,[1] important as these are in their proper place and perspective, but solely in Him who in Word and Sacrament

[1] To do so would be 'confidence in the flesh'. No one has had better ground to boast of perfection and faithfulness in tradition, in valid ordinance and divine authorization than St. Paul—but all that he counted loss for Christ (Phil. iii. 7). It is in obedience to this Apostolic example that we are summoned.

freely extends to us His Covenant of Grace. The obedience of the Church, the correctness of its orders, the faithfulness of its ministry to the Apostolic teachings and ordinances are all involved in the sin and relativity of our broken and fallen human life, but the covenant faithfulness of Christ unfailingly undergirds all as we look to Him and, in spite of our deficiencies, assimilates and binds us into living unity and continuity with Himself.

Of all that, the real and whole continuity of the Church through history in Christ, ministerial succession, or succession in the laying on of hands, is the apostolically appointed sign and attestation. Ministerial succession in no way secures the possession of the Holy Spirit nor does it guarantee a lawful ministry. But because it is the apostolically appointed ordinance, it cannot be contemned or neglected without disobedience and loss.

AUTHORITY TO ORDAIN

Ordination is the act of a presbytery: the power of ordering the work is in the whole presbytery.[1] The preaching presbyters orderly associated either in cities or neighbouring villages are those to whom the imposition of hands appertains for the congregations within their borders.[2]

Under the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, the Presbytery as a Court includes representative Elders, and these act with the ministers in the legal processes which terminate in appointing the ordination to take place. In the Ordination itself they do not act. Ordination is conferred by the Presbyters of the Court, proceeding upon resolution of the Court as a whole; or it may be conferred by a delegation of their number 'specially appointed by the presbytery' for the purpose.[3] 'The magisterial power to ordain[4] is given to the Presbytery: and the ministerial (or executive) power to regularly associated preaching presbyters.'[5]

Presbyters that they may ordain must be 'orderly associated' either as the Ministerial constituent of a regular court, or as delegated by such a court. Individual presbyters cannot ordain. Presbyters may not voluntarily associate themselves to ordain.

[1] *Form of Church Government*, 'Touching the Power of Ordination'. This is the doctrine of the corporate episcopate; see *Royal Priesthood*, ch. V.

[2] *Form of Church Government*, 'Touching the Power of Ordination'.

[3] Report, Macdonald Petition, p. 1173. *Form of Church Government*, 'Directory for Ordination', 5, 8.

[4] Or rather to authorize Ordination.

[5] *Report*, p. 1169.

They must act in their place in the Church's system. There must be behind them authority; and the authority must be that of the Church as a whole.[1] Thus, for example, Colleagues in the Pastorate of a single congregation (even though sufficient in number) are not thereby 'orderly associated' for the purpose of ordination.[2]

Presbyters orderly associated may ordain only 'for the congregations within their bounds', which mark the limits of their jurisdiction as a court. To ordain for a more general purpose (as for Foreign or Mission Service) requires the authorization of the General Assembly.

THE ELDERSHIP

'As there were in the Jewish Church elders of the people joined with the priests and Levites in the government of the Church; so Christ, who hath instituted government and governors ecclesiastical in the Church, hath furnished some in His Church, besides the Ministers of the Word, with gifts for government and with commission to exercise the same when called thereunto, who are to join with the Minister in the government of the Church. Which officers Reformed Churches commonly call Elders.'[3]

For scriptural justification of this office Calvin referred to 1 Tim. v. 17, Rom. xii. 8 and 1 Cor. xii. 28, which he interpreted in the light of evidence from the Fathers.[4] John Knox's *Book of Common Order* referred to Rom. xii, 1 Cor. xii, and Eph. iv. *The Second Book of Discipline* refers also to 1 Tim. v. 17: 'The Eldership is a Spiritual function, as is the ministry. Elders once lawfully called to the office, and having gifts of God meet to exercise the same, may not leave it again. Nevertheless such a number of Elders may be chosen in certain congregations that a part of them may relieve another for a reasonable space, as was among the Levites under the Law in serving the Temple.'[5] Additional support is adduced for this institution from (*a*) Old Testament precedents; (*b*) the fact that among the flock persons are found with those gifts of the Holy Spirit which are requisite for counsel and rule: which gifts ought to be recognized and utilized by the Church. To such persons

[1] *Report*, p. 1169.
[2] *Form of Church Government*, 'Touching the Power of Ordination'.
[3] *Form of Church Government*, 'Other Church Governors'; see G. D. Henderson, *The Scottish Ruling Elder* (1935).
[4] *Inst.* IV. 11. 1; 17. 43; *Comm. on 1 Tim.* v. 17; see above p. 81.
[5] *The Second Book of Discipline*, VI. 2.

the Church therefore gives commission for the regular exercise of the same.

Whatever be the grounds of justification alleged for this office,[1] it seems very clear that the Scottish Elder more nearly reproduces the deacon or deacon-elder of the Early Church than the 'deacon' in any of the other churches today.[2] His office is essentially diaconal and complementary to that of the Presbyter who is ordained to dispense the Word and Sacraments. Presbyter and Elder are not variants of the same office. Unlike the Presbyter the Elder is a *representative* of the people who takes part with the ministry (1) in assisting at the celebration of Holy Communion (i.e. not in the dispensing but in the receiving[3]), (2) in matters of discipline (3) in government and in the administration of affairs.[4]

The use of the word *Elder* in this connexion is intended to distinguish the holder of this office from the presbyter or minister of the Word. The Westminster Standards preferred the term 'Church-Governors' but in Scotland 'Ruling Elder' became a common designation.[5]

Elders are appointed from the Christian laity by the Kirk Session of each parish, and are publicly admitted to office by the Minister, with prayer. Their appointment was originally annual, but according to the *Second Book of Discipline* it was to be a life office. An elder from each parish, chosen by its session, represents it in the Presbytery of the bounds and Synod of the province. Each

[1] Some Presbyterians fail to find adequate Biblical authority for this office; cf. J. McKerrow, *The Office of Ruling Elder in the Christian Church* (Edinburgh, 1846) ch. V; J. M. Ross, *What is an Elder?* (Presbyterian Church of England), pp. 6f. The institution of the Eldership can nevertheless be justified, it is claimed, on the ground of the Church's inherent right 'to set down rules and directions for the better ordering of the government of the Church' (*Conf. of Faith*, XXXI. 3). (See also ibid., i. 6: 'There are some circumstances concerning . . . the government of the Church common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature, and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word, which are to be observed.')

[2] See above, pp. 80f. Cf. *The First Book of Discipline* X. 4. 'The Elders, being elected, must be admonished of their office, which is to assist the Minister in all public affairs of the Church.'

[3] Alexander Henderson, *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, I. iii. 3.

[4] 2 Chron. xix. 8. For the general function, see further references given by the *Form of Church Government* to Rom. xii. 7 and 1 Cor. xii. 28. Under the heading of 'Officers of particular Congregations', the *Form of Church Government* seems, however, to make a distinction between 'ruling', which is a function ascribed to the Pastor, and that of 'joining in government', which is ascribed to the Elder.

[5] Steuart of Pardovan, *Collections*, VII. Calvin's terms were *Senior*, *Seigneur*, or *Ancien*, which were also employed in the Reformed Churches of France and Switzerland.

year the Presbytery appoints as commissioners to the General Assembly a number of Elders equal to the number of ministers.[1]

The Church of Scotland has always taught that the Elder is not a minister;[2] that he does not labour in the Word and doctrine or administer the Sacraments.[3] The Westminster Assembly made it quite clear that the Elder is not a Presbyter, but is to be regarded as a representative of the people in assisting the pastoral work of the ministry while ministers were not regarded as representatives of the people but as sent to the people by Christ. The Elder is not ordained by the laying on of hands. He is set apart with prayer. In Pardovan's *Collections* the Elders' duties are described under three heads.

(1) They are to assist in seeking the fruit of the Word sown among the people by the ministry, and to assist in the discipline of communicants and in visiting the sick.

(2) They are to have 'certain bounds' assigned to them for regular visitation in the interests of the pastoral care of the congregation, when it is fitting for them to set some time apart for prayer.

(3) They also have more public duties in the Church courts, in which commissioned Elders have the same power as pastors. 'Howbeit by the practice of our Church, the execution of some decrees of the Church belong to the pastors only, such as the imposition of hands, pronouncing the sentences of excommunication and absolution, the receiving of penitents, the intimations of

[1] J. T. Cox: *Practice and Procedure of the Church of Scotland*, 3rd edit., 1945, p. 166.

[2] 'They differ from the Minister in that they preach not the Word nor minister the Sacrament' (John Knox, *Book of Common Order*, ii). The Minister is always Moderator of the Kirk Session and is not responsible to the Kirk Session, but to the Presbytery, for the discharge of his ministerial functions. Though the Elders assist the Minister in the distribution of the Elements at the Lord's Supper, the Lord's Supper is a ministerial, not a sessional, act and the Kirk Session does not, accordingly, require to be constituted. 'As the Minister is allowed, subject to his Presbytery, a large discretion in the methods of his ministry, the place of worship and other ecclesiastical buildings belonging to the congregation are at his disposal for the purpose of his office. He can use them, and grant permission to use them, for all purposes connected with the congregation or any of its organizations; and for purposes which are of religious, ecclesiastical, or charitable nature, though not connected with the congregation, subject only to the control of the Presbytery . . . neither the Kirk Session nor the Deacons' Court nor the congregational Board can use them, or grant permission to use them, for any purpose without the minister's consent' (Act of Assembly, 1932, XVII).

[3] 'Such as are commonly called Elders labour not in the Word and Doctrine' (*Second Book of Discipline*, VII).

sentences and censures about Ministers, and such like. In short, the Elder is to speak nothing to the Church from the pulpit.'[1]

THE DIACONATE

'The Scripture doth hold out Deacons as distinct officers in the Church. Whose office is perpetual. To whose office it belongs not to preach the Word or administer the Sacraments, but to take special care in distributing to the necessities of the poor.'[2]

While the Standards of the Church of Scotland recognize that the Deacon had a wider function in the Early Church, his duties at the Reformation were nevertheless restricted mainly to the administration of the Church finances and the care of the poor, but he might assist at Holy Communion. 'They may be employed to provide the Elements, to carry them, and serve the communicants at the Lord's Table.'[3] The Deacon was virtually an assistant elder, and might attend the Kirk Sessions, but only in a consultative capacity. It was because his functions were included in those of the elder that the deacon tended to disappear from the church in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.[4] In many churches today deacons have returned to occupy the position of assistants to the Kirk Session. In earlier times they were admitted in the same way as elders,[5] 'solemnly received with lifted up hands, giving their promises to be faithful'.[6] Today they are either elected for life and 'ordained', and admitted by the Kirk Sessions to their office, or they are elected for a term of years but are not 'ordained', for the purpose of administering the temporal affairs of the congregation. They do not assist at Holy Communion and have no spiritual jurisdiction.[7]

[1] *Collections*, I. vi. 7–8. See also G. Gillespie, *Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland in Points of Ruling-Elders, and of the authority of Presbyteries and Synods* (1641), II; Mair, *Digest of Church Laws*, 3rd edition, p. 126; also in J. T. Cox, op. cit.; C. L. Warr, *The Presbyterian Tradition* (Maclehose, 1933), pp. 372–4.

[2] *Form of Church Government*, 'Deacons'.

[3] Steuart of Pardovan, *Collections*, I. viii. 3.

[4] See Steuart of Pardovan, op. cit., I. viii. 1; J. M. Ross, *What is an Elder?*, p. 12.

[5] *Acts of Assembly*, 1582, Session 12.

[6] Alexander Henderson, *The Government and Order of the Church of Scotland*, I. ii, pp. 14f.

[7] Cox, *Practice and Procedure of the Church of Scotland*, pp. 30ff., 119f.

ORDER

The Church of Jesus Christ is ordered from beyond its empirical being and existence by the power of the Word of God. By that Word it is called and formed to be the community in the midst of the world which is given to share already in the new creation and its new order through the Communion of the Spirit. But this Church is sent by Christ to live its life and fulfil its mission in the midst of a divided and disordered world, both by proclaiming the Gospel of reconciliation and by living it out in a reconciled life. It belongs to the very nature of this Church to manifest the unity of the Triune God in the inner unity of its faith and life in the Spirit, but also to translate that unity into its outward behaviour within temporal and physical existence. It is in and through this reconciliation of its outward life in the world with its inner life in Christ that the Church fulfils its holy ministry in the Gospel. Order is therefore the form that the life of the Church takes in its conformity to Christ through His Word and Spirit, and in obedient fulfilment of its mission of reconciliation. True order in the Church of Christ is order that points above and beyond its historical forms to the new divine order in Christ, and points beyond its present forms to the future manifestation of its order in the new creation. Actual order in the Church throughout its historical pilgrimage is thus ambivalent and provisional. It is order that derives from beyond itself and order that exercises a provisional service in history until Christ comes again.

That is the doctrine that lay behind the reforming and re-ordering of the Church of Scotland at the Reformation. As *The Second Book of Discipline* described it:

> This power ecclesiastical is an authority granted by God the Father, through the Mediator Jesus Christ, unto His Kirk gathered, and having its ground in the Word of God, to be put into execution by them unto whom the spiritual government of the Kirk by lawful calling is committed. The Polity of the Kirk flowing from this Power is an Order or Form of spiritual Government which is exercised by the members appointed thereunto by the Word of God. And therefore it is given immediately to the Office-bearers by whom it is exercised to the wellbeing of the whole Body. . . . Therefore this Power and Polity of the Kirk should lean upon the Word of God immediately as the only ground thereof, and should be taken from the pure fountain of the

Scriptures, the Kirk hearing the Voice of Christ, the only Spiritual King, and being ruled by His Laws.[1]

Church Order has therefore a permanent and stable element that derives directly from the Word and its ordering of the life of the Church through the ministry, but because this ordering of the life of the Church has to be carried out within the conditions of our erring and sinful world it cannot but partake of sin and error, it also has a variable element liable to error. Therefore it must ever be renewed and reformed by reference back to the creative Word of God. And so the *Scots Confession* of 1560, which represents the first attempt to restore to the Church an order in its faith and life in obedient conformity to Christ and His Word, acknowledged that no 'Order and Polity in *Ceremonies*' can be appointed for all ages, times and places.[2] In other words, the Church has a variable element in its order and polity that must constantly be checked and be re-adapted in fulfilment of the mission of the Church.[3] Therefore the Confession contained the following words in its preface:

. . . Protesting that if any man will note in this our Confession any article or sentence repugnant to God's Holy Word, that it would please him of his gentleness and for Christian charity's sake to admonish us of the same in writing; and we upon our honours and fidelity, by God's Grace do promise unto him satisfaction from the Mouth of God, that is from His Holy Scriptures, or else reformation of that which shall prove to be amiss.[4]

It is in that sense that the Church of Scotland claims to be a Reformed Church, *ecclesia reformata et semper reformanda*. It is in that very spirit also that the Church of Scotland framed and adopted the *Ecumenical Statement* of 1954, as a clear indication of its future relations with other Churches in the mission of the One Lord and His Gospel of Reconciliation.

The Church of Scotland, believing in one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and acknowledging one Baptism for the remission of sins, affirms its intention of seeking closer relations with every other Church

[1] I. ii. 3, 7. [2] Art. xx.

[3] The Church's deep sense of its mission is indicated by the printing of the following words from Matt. xxiv. 14 on the title-page of the first printed edition of the Confession: 'And this Gospel of the Kingdom shall be preached throughout the whole world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come.'

[4] Ed. by G. D. Henderson, p. 41.

with which it stands in fundamental doctrinal agreement, but from which it is separated in matters of government and the ordering of the ministry.

In its approach to other Churches in which it discerns the one Body of Christ, the Church of Scotland would desire to look beyond the divisions of history to the ultimate fulness and unity of the Church's life in Christ, and to affirm its readiness to consider how the contributions of all such Churches may be embraced within that unity and fulness, always, however, in agreement with the Word of God and the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith.

In such approaches the Church of Scotland would seek to join, humbly and penitently, with its sister Churches in fulfilment of the Lord's prayer that all who believe in Him might be one.

NOTE

Bishop Gore has an interesting passage (*Church and Ministry*, pp. 62–4) in which he exalts 'the principle of apostolic succession above the question of the exact form of the ministry in which the principle has expressed itself'. Monepiscopacy, he says, is rather the outcome of a principle than itself a principle. 'Nobody would maintain that the continuity of the Church would be broken if in any given diocese all the presbyters were consecrated to the Episcopal Office and governed as a co-ordinate College of Bishops without Presbyters or Presbyter-Bishops. . . . Something equivalent to this arrangement has been commonly believed in the West to have existed in the early Church.'[1] The belief referred to is of course that of, e.g., Lightfoot (*Dissertation* appended to his Commentary on Philippians), that a collegiate episcopate preceded a monarchical.[2] It is further, however, a belief that these colleges were composed of *presbyters*. The term 'presbyter-bishop' is a convenient invention of recent date. It occurs in no ancient

[1] cf. also D. Stone, *Episcopacy and Valid Orders in the Primitive Church*, 1926, iii f: 'An episcopal succession in which there was a body of Presbyters who had received the episcopal power and authority, who for a time shared in the act of ordaining which was later restricted to one monarchical Bishop, would be, so far as the point of the maintenance of the succession is concerned, the same in principle as the rule of a single Bishop.'

[2] This belief is still held by the great majority of scholars even in the Roman Church. It is also widely recognized that, after monepiscopacy arose, in several important centres, such as Alexandria and Rome and Lyons, the bishop received only presbyteral consecration. See the discussions in the *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* by Einar Molland, 1950, vol. i, pp. 12–28; by W. Telfer, vol. iii, 1957, pp. 1–13; E. W. Kemp, 1955, vol. vi, pp. 125–42; K. J. Woolcombe, *The Historic Episcopate* (ed. by K. M. Carey), pp. 41ff.

authority. There is no ground for the implication that an *order* of presbyter-bishops distinct from presbyters ever existed. The fact, drily stated, is that in certain places—which constituted at the least a large proportion of those of which we have information—presbyters are found exercising the oversight conjointly; nor is the fact changed by referring to them as a 'plural episcopate'. They were presbyters forming a college or presbytery which exercised government.[1]

It is extremely difficult to see how such presbyteries or colleges differ in principle from those which were set up at the Reformation among ourselves, especially the Presbytery considered as the '*corporate episcopate*' in which Presbyters exercise episcopal office, partly conjointly in Presbytery and partly individually in their own parishes—ordination being severely restricted to the 'Presbytery as a whole' acting under the presidency of its Moderator. Bishop Gore acknowledged that ordinary arrangements of the Ministry may be departed from (or at least that the violation is of secondary importance) if the principle of the Apostolic succession be not violated. The *principle* in question has not been violated—it has been most carefully conserved by us, and is maintained in our practice: of that there can hardly be dispute.[2]

Gore, however, had this difficulty, that, if presbyters ever possessed and exercised in common the power to transmit Orders, this power had been lost to them and was not possessed by those presbyters who at and after the Reformation believed that they possessed and could validly exercise it. He thought that they assumed a function not committed to them—taking the honour to themselves.

[1] See the conclusions of J. Wordsworth (*The Ministry of Grace*, 1901, p. 142): 'A dispassionate study of the evidence leads us to these conclusions: (1) that the three orders of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, existed from the time of the Apostles, in certain parts of the Church, especially in Palestine, Syria and the Province of Asia; (2) that in some other parts, especially at Rome and Alexandria, there were at first only two orders, the governing order acting normally as a corporate body or college; (3) that in process of time, and more particularly in the course of the third century, the governing order tended more and more to act in the matter of ordination through its Presidents, although the right of the latter to act normally alone has never been regularly established except in Rome; (4) that in this way the governing order in the West has been differentiated into two degrees, though a tradition has always been kept up that they had an essential unity of character, now defined as 'Priesthood' or 'Sarcedotium'. These conclusions have recently been reaffirmed by E. W. Kemp after a careful review of the evidence and modern research, including the discussions of Gore, and Telfer, *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, 1955, vi, pp. 125–42.

[2] See *Reunion*, pp. 17–48, and Report in Macdonald Case, *Reports*, 1911.

This supposes that the nature of a Divine Ordinance can be altered by canon—which is an unsafe position. It is the position, e.g. of the Bull of Leo XIII, which rejected the Orders of the Church of England on the ground of the absence from the Anglican Ordinal of the *Traditio Instrumentorum*. The powers of an order of the Ministry, divinely instituted, are inherent in the institution of the order. The Church ministerially confers the order, and therewith all that the Lord has included in the commission of that order. Exercise may be restrained by canon, but power is not thereby taken away, and the necessity of circumstance may supersede canon. In the Scotland of the sixteenth century the existing 'arrangement in the ministry' had collapsed by the abdication or by the impossibility of the persons representing it, and the restraints which custom and regulation had laid on the fundamental ministry of the presbyterate might very well seem to be in suspense. In falling back upon the inherent and institutional capacities of that ministry for government and for propagation of orders, the *principle* of succession was not violated. That which Presbyters had received of *the Lord* they delivered to us.

As for 'assuming' function or 'taking honour to themselves' in a manner morally discoloured by personal self-assertion,[1] it must be remembered that the doctrine of Jerome as to the fundamental identity of the orders of presbyter and bishop was the current doctrine of the Schools[2]—the Reformers were not the first to bring it up: they had learnt it in the Roman Communion, found it widely attested in the Early Catholic Church, and they applied it in good faith to the necessity in which they found the Church to stand: not taking honour to themselves in any self-assertive spirit, but rather confessing a responsibility which they believed to have been committed to them by the Head of the Church in their ordination.

[1] *Church and Ministry*, p. 63; cf. 304.

[2] The English Reformers accepted the doctrine as fully as others. *Institution of a Christian Man* (approved by Convocation, 1537): 'In the New Testament there is no mention made of any degrees or distinction in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of Presbyters or Bishops'; and *The King's Book*, 1540, 'of these two orders only, priests and deacons, Scripture maketh express mention'. 'S. Hieronymi sententia universae ecclesiae Latinae acceptissima fuit et immerito a multis theologis cum gravi censura repudiata: imprudentes enim cum S. Hieronymo universam prope ecclesiam Latinam condemnarunt.' (Morinus, *de Sacr. Ordinat.*, pars. iii. ex. iii. 2, 19). For a review of the evidence see Robert Boyd of Trochrig, *In Epist. ad Ephesios Praelectiones*, 4. 11, pp. 499ff.; and John Forbes of Corse, *Instructiones Historico-Theologicae*, XVI. 1.

The conception that an evolutionary office or 'arrangement of the Ministry' can by ecclesiastical authority or by prescription of usage attain to an obligatory relation to conscience or become necessary to validity, is perilous to others than Presbyterians. For on that ground it is difficult to see how the Roman obedience can be other than obligatory and necessary for Tractarians. And if canonical restriction must always stand as sufficient to bar valid exercise of the powers of order, a question seems to be raised of the action of Bishops who were consecrated under that obedience, and with commission in which the exercise of episcopal functions in separation from the Roman See was certainly not contemplated.

Appendixes

A. THE LORD'S SUPPER

§13. Moreover, if the reason for communicating with Jesus Christ is to have part and portion in all the graces which He purchased for us by His death, the thing requisite must be not only to be partakers of His Spirit, but also to participate in His humanity, in which He rendered all obedience to God His Father, in order to satisfy our debts, although, properly speaking, the one cannot be without the other; for when He gives Himself to us, it is in order that we may possess Him entirely. Hence, as it is said that His Spirit is our life, so He Himself, with His own lips, declares that His flesh is meat indeed, and His blood drink indeed (John vi. 55). If these words are not to go for nothing, it follows that in order to have our life in Christ our souls must feed on His body and blood as their proper food. This, then, is expressly attested in the Supper, when of the bread it is said to us that we are to take it and eat it, and that it is His body, and of the cup that we are to drink it, and that it is His blood. This is expressly spoken of the body and blood, in order that we may learn to seek there the substance of our spiritual life. . . .

§15. Thus it is with the communion which we have in the body and blood of the Lord Jesus. It is a spiritual mystery which can neither be seen by the eye nor comprehended by the human understanding. It is therefore figured to us by visible signs, according as our weakness requires, in such manner, nevertheless, that it is not a bare figure but is combined with the reality and substance. It is with good reason then that the bread is called the body since it not only represents but also presents it to us. Hence we indeed infer that the name of the body of Jesus Christ is transferred to the bread, inasmuch as it is the sacrament and figure of it. But we likewise add, that the sacraments of the Lord should not and cannot be at all separated from their reality and substance. To distinguish, in order to guard against confounding them, is not only good and reasonable, but altogether necessary; but to divide them, so as to make the one exist without the other, is absurd. . . .

§17. We must confess, then, that if the representation which God gives us in the Supper is true, the internal substance of the sacrament is conjoined with the visible signs; and as the bread is distributed to us by the hand, so the body of Christ is communicated to us in order that

we may be made partakers of it. Though there should be nothing more, we have good cause to be satisfied, when we understand that Jesus Christ gives us in the Supper the proper substance of His body and blood, in order that we may possess it fully, and possessing it have part in all His blessings.

JOHN CALVIN: *Short Treatise on the Lord's Supper, Tracts and Treatises* (edit. 1958), vol. II, pp. 170ff.

B. THE REAL PRESENCE

§5. . . . There are two faults to be avoided, so that we may not unduly depreciate the signs and separate them from the mysteries to which in some way they are attached, or excessively exalt them and seem to obscure the mysteries themselves. That Christ is the Bread of Life by which the faithful are nourished to eternal salvation no one who is not utterly irreligious would fail to admit. But there is not equal agreement as to what is the method of partaking of Him. For there are those who define eating the flesh of Christ and drinking His blood as nothing else than believing on Christ Himself. But to me Christ seems to have intended to teach something more express and lofty in that famous discourse in which He commends to us the eating of His flesh, namely, that we are quickened by a real participation of Him, which He described by the words eating and drinking so that no one should think that the life which we receive from Him is received merely by thought. For, as not the sight of bread but the eating of bread supplies the body with nourishment, so it is fitting that the soul should really and inwardly be partaker of Christ in order that by His power it may be quickened into spiritual life. Yet we acknowledge that this eating is the work of faith, as it cannot be imagined to be anything else. But between my statement and that of those whom I am opposing there is this difference, that to them to eat is only to believe, so that the flesh of Christ is eaten by believing that He is made ours by faith, whereas I say that this eating is the fruit and result of faith. Or if you desire a clearer statement, to them eating is faith, to me it seems rather to ensue from faith. The difference may be small in words, but it is not unimportant in fact. For, though the Apostle teaches that Christ dwells in our hearts through faith, yet no one would interpret this dwelling to be faith, but all perceive that the splendid result of faith is described, that through it the faithful attain to the possession of Christ abiding in them. After this manner, in calling Himself the Bread of Life the Lord willed to teach not only that salvation is laid up for us in faith in His death and resurrection, but also that a real communication of Himself brings to pass that His life passes into us and becomes ours, not otherwise than bread, when it is taken for nourishment, supplies strength to the

body. . . . Let it be a conclusion that our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ as our bodily life is sustained by bread and wine. For the analogy of the sign would not hold good if our souls did not find their nourishment in Christ, which cannot be unless Christ is really joined to us and refreshes us by the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood. And, though in so great distance of place it seems incredible that the flesh of Christ should reach to us so as to be our food, let us remember how greatly the hidden power of the Holy Ghost surpasses all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish that His limitless force should be measured by our standard. What then our mind does not understand, let faith receive, namely, that the Holy Ghost really unites what are divided in place. . . . I acknowledge that the breaking of the bread is a symbol, not the thing itself. But when this has been laid down, we shall rightly infer that in the exhibition of the symbol the thing itself is exhibited. . . . Why does the Lord give into your hands the symbol of His body if it be not to assure you of real participation of Him? But, if it is true that a visible sign is bestowed on us to ratify the gift of the invisible thing, let us believe that, when the symbol of the body is received, the body itself is no less certainly given to us.

JOHN CALVIN: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV, ch. xvii, 5f.

C. THIS SACRED FEAST

§42. . . . this sacred feast is medicine to the sick, comfort to the sinner, and bounty to the poor. . . . For while Christ is therein given us for food, we perceive that without Him we fail, pine and waste away, just as hunger destroys the vigour of the body. Next, as He is given for life, we perceive that without Him we are certainly dead. Wherefore, the best and only worthiness we can bring to God, is to offer Him our own vileness, and, if I may so speak, unworthiness, that His mercy may make us worthy; to despond in ourselves, that we may be consoled in Him; to humble ourselves, that we may be elevated by Him; to accuse ourselves that we may be justified by Him; to aspire moreover to the unity which He recommends in the Supper; and as He makes us all one in Himself, to desire to have all one soul, one heart, one tongue. If we ponder and meditate on these things, we may be shaken but will never be overwhelmed by such considerations as these, how shall we . . . worthily eat the body of the Lord? We shall rather consider that we, who are poor, are coming to a benevolent giver, sick to a physician, sinful to the author of righteousness, in fine, dead to him who gives life; that worthiness, which is commanded by God, consists especially in faith, which places all things in Christ, nothing in ourselves, and in charity, charity which, though imperfect, it may be sufficient to offer to God, that He may increase it, since it cannot be fully rendered. . . .

JOHN CALVIN: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV, ch. xvii, 42.

D. FREQUENCY AND ORDER OF SERVICE AT THE EUCHARIST

§43. . . . that sacrament might be celebrated in the most becoming manner, if it were dispensed to the Church very frequently, at least once a week. The commencement should be with public prayer; next a sermon should be delivered: then the minister, having placed bread and wine on the table, should read the institution of the Supper. He should next explain the promises which are therein given; and, at the same time, keep back from communion all those who are debarred by the prohibition of the Lord. He should afterwards pray that the Lord, with the kindness with which He has bestowed the sacred food upon us, would also form and instruct us to receive it with faith and gratitude; and, as we are of ourselves unworthy, would make us worthy of the feast by His mercy. Here, either a psalm should be sung, or something read, while the faithful, in order, communicate at the sacred feast, the minister breaking the bread and giving it to the people. The Supper being ended, an exhortation should be given to sincere faith, and confession of faith, to charity, and lives becoming Christians. Lastly, thanks should be offered, and the praises of God should be sung. This being done, the Church should be dismissed in peace.

§44. . . . all Christians might have [the sacrament] in frequent use . . . thereby sustaining and confirming their faith. . . . That such was the practice of the Apostolic Church, we are informed by Luke in the Acts, when, he says 'They continued steadfastly in breaking of bread, and in prayers' (Acts ii. 42). Thus we ought always to provide that no meeting of the Church is held without the word, prayer, the dispensation of the Supper, and alms.

JOHN CALVIN: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV. ch. xvii, 43–4.

E. CHRIST'S SACRIFICE AND OURS

§13. For either an oblation for sin was made by a certain species of satisfaction, by which the penalty was redeemed before God, or it was a symbol and attestation of religion and divine worship, at one time in the way of supplication to demand the favour of God; at another, by way of thanksgiving, to testify gratitude to God for benefits received; at another, as a simple exercise of piety to renew the sanction of the covenant, to which latter branch, burnt-offerings, and libations, oblations, first-fruits, and peace-offerings, referred. Hence, let us also distribute them into two classes. The one class with the view of explaining, let us call *λατρευτικόν*, and *σεβαστικόν*, as consisting of the veneration and worship which believers both owe and render to

God; or, if you prefer it, let us call it εὐχαριστικόν since it is exhibited to God by none but those who, enriched with His boundless benefits, offer themselves and all their actions to Him in return. The other class let us call propitiatory or expiatory. A sacrifice of expiation is one whose object is to appease the wrath of God, to satisfy His justice, and thereby wipe and wash away the sins, by which the sinner being cleansed and restored to purity, may return to favour with God. Hence the name which was given in the Law to the victims which were offered in expiation of sin, 'a sin offering for atonement' (Exod. xxix. 36): not that they were adequate to regain the favour of God, and wipe away guilt, but because they typified the true sacrifice of this nature, which was at length performed in reality by Christ alone; by Him alone, because no other could, and once, because the efficacy and power of the one sacrifice performed by Christ is eternal, as He declared by His voice, when He said, 'It is finished'; that is, that everything necessary to regain the favour of the Father, to procure forgiveness of sins, righteousness, and salvation, that all this was performed and consummated by His one oblation, and that hence nothing was wanting. No place was left for another sacrifice.

§16. Under the other kind of sacrifice, which we have called eucharistic, are included all the offices of charity, by which, while we embrace our brethren, we honour the Lord Himself in His members; in fine, all our prayers, praises, thanksgivings, and every act of worship which we perform to God. All these depend on the greater sacrifice with which we dedicate ourselves, soul and body, to be a holy temple to the Lord. For it is not enough that our external acts be framed to obedience, but we must dedicate and consecrate first ourselves, and, secondly, all that we have, so that all which is in us may be subservient to his glory, and be stirred up to magnify it. This kind of sacrifice has nothing to do with appeasing God, with obtaining remission of sins, with procuring justification, but is wholly employed in magnifying and extolling God, since it cannot be grateful and acceptable to God unless at the hand of those who, having received forgiveness of sins, have already been reconciled and freed from guilt. This is so necessary to the Church, that it cannot be dispensed with. Therefore, it will endure for ever, so long as the people of God shall endure.
JOHN CALVIN: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV, ch. xviii, 13, 16.

F. A ROYAL PRIESTHOOD

§17. . . . The kind of sacrifice is indispensable in the Lord's Supper, in which, while we show forth His death, and give Him thanks, we offer nothing but the sacrifice of praise. From this office of sacrificing, all

Christians are called 'a royal priesthood', because by Christ we offer the sacrifice of praise of which the apostle speaks, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to His name (1 Pet. ii. 9; Heb. xiii. 15). We do not appear with our gifts in the presence of God without an intercessor. Christ is our Mediator, by whose intervention we offer ourselves and our all to the Father; He is our High Priest, who, having entered into the upper sanctuary, opens up an access for us: He is the altar[1] on which we lay our gifts, that whatever we do attempt, we may attempt in Him; He it is, I say, who 'hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father' (Rev. i. 6).

JOHN CALVIN: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. IV, ch. xviii, 17.

G. 'OF THE CONTINUANCE, INCREASE, AND PRESERVATION OF THE KIRK'

We most constantly believe that God preserved, instructed, multiplied, honoured, decored, and from death called to life, His Kirk in all ages from Adam till the coming of Jesus Christ in the flesh. For Abraham He called from his Father's country, him He instructed, his seed He multiplied; the same He marvellously preserved, and more marvellously delivered from the bondage and tyranny of Pharaoh; to them He gave His laws, constitutions and ceremonies; them He possessed in the land of Canaan; to them after Judges, and after Saul, He gave David to be King, to whom He made promise, that of the fruit of his loins should one sit for ever upon his regal seat. To this same people from time to time He sent prophets, to reduce them to the right way of their God: from the which often they declined by idolatry. And because of their stubborn contempt of justice He was compelled to give them into the hands of their enemies, as before was threatened by the mouth of Moses, insomuch as the Holy City was destroyed, the temple burned with fire, and the whole land left desolate the space of seventy years; yet of mercy did He lead them back again to Jerusalem where the city and temple were rebuilt, and they against all temptations and assaults of Satan did abide till the Messiah came according to the Prophets.

The Scots Confession, 1560, Article v.

H. 'OF THE KIRK'

As we believe in one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, so do we most constantly believe that from the beginning there has been and now is, and to the end of the world shall be, one Kirk, that is to say one company

[1] 'The people of God', wrote Calderwood in 1618, 'had an altar for a sacrifice and a table for a feast . . . so Christians have one altar for one sacrifice, to wit, Christ who is Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice, Heb. xiii. 10, and a table for a feast after his sacrifice was once made, to wit, the Sacrament of the Supper.'

and multitude of men chosen of God who rightly worship and embrace Him by true faith in Jesus Christ, who is the only head of the same Kirk, which also is the body and spouse of Christ Jesus, which Church is catholic, that is universal, because it contains the elect of all ages, of all realms, nations, and tongues, be they of the Jews, or be they of the Gentiles, which have communion and society with God the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ, through the sanctification of the Holy Spirit: and therefore it is called the communion, not of profane persons, but of saints, who as citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem have the fruition of the most inestimable benefits, to wit, of one God, one Lord Jesus, one faith, and one baptism: Out of the which Church there is neither life nor eternal happiness. . . .

The Scots Confession, 1560, Article xvi.

I. THE SIGN OF THE TRUE KIRK

. . . The note therefore of the true Kirk of God we believe, confess, and avow to be, first, the true preaching of the Word of God in which God has revealed Himself unto us, as the writings of the prophets and apostles do declare. Secondly, the right administration of the Sacraments of Christ Jesus, which must be annexed unto the Word and promise of God, to seal and form the same in our hearts. Last, ecclesiastical discipline uprightly ministered, as God's Word prescribed, whereby vice is repressed and virtue nourished. . . .

The Scots Confession, 1560, Article xviii.

J. ACTS OF ASSEMBLY: THE ORDER OF SERVICES

June 1564—No. 3.

It was ordained that every minister, exhorter, and reader, shall have one of the psalm-books lately printed in Edinburgh, and use the order therein contained in prayers, marriage, and ministration of the sacraments in book of common order.

December 1564—No. 5.

Ministers, &c., to have psalm-books, and use order therein in prayers, marriage, and ministration of sacraments.

K. JOHN KNOX'S EXHORTATION TO COMMUNION

Dearly beloved in the Lord, forasmuch as we are now assembled to celebrate the Holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, let us consider these words of St. Paul, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves before they presume

to eat of that bread and to drink of that cup; for as the benefit is great, if, with a true penitent heart and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood, then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us, we be one with Christ, and Christ with us), so is the danger great if we receive the same unworthily, for then we be guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour, we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's body, we kindle God's wrath against us, and provoke Him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kind of death. . . . Let us consider then, that this Sacrament is a singular medicine for all poor sick creatures, a comfortable help to weak souls, and that our Lord requireth no other worthiness on our part but that we unfeignedly acknowledge our naughtiness and imperfection. Then, to the end that we may be worthy partakers of His merits, and most comfortable benefits, which is the true eating of His flesh and drinking of His blood, let us not suffer our minds to wander about the consideration of these earthly and corruptible things (which we see present to our eyes and feel with our hands), to seek Christ bodily present in them, as if He were enclosed in the bread and wine, or as if these elements were turned and changed into the substance of his flesh and blood; for the only way to dispose our souls to receive nourishment, relief, and quickening of His substance is to lift up our minds by faith above all things worldly and sensible, and thereby to enter into heaven, that we may find and receive Christ, where He dwelleth undoubtedly very God and very Man in the incomprehensible glory of the Father, to whom be all praise, honour, and glory, now and ever. Amen.

Exhortation to Communion in what is commonly called *John Knox's Liturgy*.

L. FROM JOHN CRAIG'S CATECHISM OF 1581

Question: What are the principal heads of His [Christ's] promise?

Answer: They are contained in our Belief called the Creed of the Apostles.

Q. Rehearse the Belief or Creed of the Apostles.

A. I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and in Jesus Christ His only Son our Lord: who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried, and descended into Hell: He rose again the third day from dead, He ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, the Father Almighty: from there He will come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church Universal, the

Communion of Saints: the forgiveness of sins, the rising again of the bodies, and life everlasting.

. . .

Q. What is the Kirk which we confess here?
A. The whole company of God's elect called and sanctified.
Q. Do we believe in this Kirk?
A. No, but we believe only in our God.
Q. What thing, then, believe we of this Kirk?
A. That it was, is, and shall be to the end of the world.
Q. What need we to believe this?
A. For our great comfort and glory of God.
Q. Declare [explain] that plainly.
A. The love of the Father, the death of Christ, and the power of the Spirit shall ever work in some.
Q. What thing followeth upon this?
A. The glory of God and the confusion of Satan, with our comfort.

. . .

Q. How many Kirks are there in the world?
A. One Kirk, one Christ, as one Body and the Head.
Q. Is it bound to any particular time, place, or presence?
A. No, for then it would not be universal.
Q. What is the Communion of Saints?
A. The mutual participation of Christ, and His graces among His members.
Q. What followeth upon this Communion?
A. A spiritual union and Communion among all Christ's members.
Q. Whereupon is this Communion grounded?
A. Upon their union with Christ their Head.
Q. Who maketh our union with Christ and among ourselves?
A. The Holy Spirit by His mighty power.
Q. Is there a salvation without this Communion?
A. None at all, for Christ is the ground of salvation.
Q. May men be joined with Christ and not with His saints?
A. No, nor yet with the saints and not with Christ.
Q. What then should be our principal care?
A. To hold fast our union with Christ our Head.
Q. What followeth upon that?
A. Then of necessity we are joined with all His saints and Kirk.
Q. Should we not seek them and join with them externally also?
A. No doubt, whensoever we may see them or hear of them in particular.
Q. How may we know this company externally?

A. By the true profession of the Word and Holy Sacraments. . . .

. . .

Q. What then is the infallible token of Christ's Kirk?
A. The Word truly preached and professed.

M. MINISTRY

. . . Which office is the preaching of the Evangell, and ministratioun of the sacraments. And this office is spirituall, and therefore belongeth to the kirk, who onlie hath the distributioun and ministratioun of spirituall things. So, by the kirk spirituall offices are distributed, and men admitted and receaved thereto. And the administratioun of the power is committed by the kirk to bishops or superintendents. . . .

That this perteaneth, by the Scriptures of God, to bishops or superintendents, is manifest: for the Apostle Paul writteth unto Timothie, Cap. ii ver. 2 . . .

And in another place, 1 Tim. Cap. v. ver. 22 . . .

The Apostle also writting to Titus, Bishop of Creet, putteth him in remembrance of his office, which was to admitt and appoint ministers in everie citie and congregation. . . .

Thus we have expressed plainlie by Scriptures, that to the office of a bishop perteaneth examinatioun and admissioun to spirituall cure and office, and also to oversee them who are admitted, that they walke uprightlie, and exerce their office faithfullie and purelie. To tak this power from the bishop or superintendent is to take away the office of a bishop, that no bishop be in the kirk; which were to alter and abolishe the order which God hath appointed in his kirk. There is a spirituall jurisdictioun and power which God hath givin unto his kirk, and to these who beare office therin; and there is a temporall power givin of God to kings and civill magistrats. Both the powers are of God, and most agreing to the fortifeing one of another, if they be right used. But when the corruptioun of man entereth in, confounding the offices, usurping to himself what he pleaseth, nothing regarding the good order appointed of God, then confusioun followeth in all estats. . . .

The kirk of God sould fortifie all lawfull power and authoritie that perteaneth to the civill magistrat, becaus it is the ordinance of God. But if he passe the bounds of his office, and enter within the sanctuarie of the Lord, medling with suche things as apperteane to the ministers of God's kirk; as Uzziah the King of Judah did, 2 Paral. xvi, entering in the Temple to burne incense, the which perteaned not to his office, then the servants of God sould withstand his unjust interprise, as did the preest at that time withstand the King of Judah; for so they are commanded of God. The servants of God, when suche wickednesse occurreth, sould not keepe silence, flattering princes in vaine pride, but

withstand and reprove them in their iniquitie: and who doeth otherwise is unworthie to beare in God's kirk anie office. A greater offence or contempt of God and his kirk can no prince doe, than to sett up by his authoritie men in spirituall offices, as to creat bishops and pastors of the kirk; for so to doe, is to conclude no kirk of God to be; for the kirk can not be, without it have the owne proper jurisdictioun and libertie, with the ministratioun of suche offices as God hath appointed. In speeking this tuiching the libertie of the kirk I meane not the hurt of the king or others in their patronages, but that they have their priviledges of presentatioun according to the lawes; providing alwise that the examinatioun and admissioun perteane onlie to the kirk, of all benefices having cure of soules. . . .

As to the questioun, If it be expedient a superintendent to be where a qualified bishop is, I understand a bishop or superintendent to be but one office; and where the one is the other is. But having some respect to the cace whereupon the questioun is moved, I answere, The superintendents that are placed ought to continue in their offices, notwithstanding anie others that intruse themselves, or are placed by suche as have no power in suche offices. They may be called bishops, but are not bishops, but idols, (Zech. xi. 17) sayeth the prophet. And, therefore, the superindendents which are called, and placed orderlie by the kirk, have the office and jurisdictioun; and the other bishops, so called, have no office nor jurisdictioun in the kirk of God; for they enter not by the doore, but by another way, and therefore are not pastors, sayeth Christ, but theeves and robbers. . . .

Lett suche men understand, of whatsoever estat they be, that the ministers of God's kirk have receaved an office of God above them, wherunto they ought to be subject and obedient; and have receaved a power of God to cast doun and destroy the pride of man, and to bring in subjectioun all things that exalt themselves against God, 2 Cor. x. 5.

From John Erskine of Dun's letter to the Regent (1571,) quoted in *The History of the Kirk of Scotland* by David Calderwood, Vol. iii, pp. 157–62.

N. THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION: OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

i. Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein he was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in his church unto the end of the world, for the perpetual remembrance of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further engagement in and to all duties which they owe unto him, and to be a bond and pledge of their communion

with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body.

iii. The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed his ministers to declare his word of institution to the people, to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use; and to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and (they communicating also themselves) to give both to the communicants; but to none who are not then present in the congregation.

v. The outward elements of this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit, in substance and nature, they still remain truly and only bread and wine, as they were before.

vii. Worthy receivers, outwardly partaking of the visible elements in this sacrament, do then also inwardly by faith, really and indeed, yet not carnally and corporally, but spiritually, receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death: the body and blood of Christ being then not corporally or carnally in, with, or under the bread and wine; yet as really, but spiritually, present to the faith of believers in that ordinance, as the elements themselves are to their outward senses.

The Westminster Confession, Ch. XXIX.

O. ARTICLES DECLARATORY OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND IN MATTERS SPIRITUAL

i. The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or Universal Church; worshipping one God, Almighty, all-wise, and all-loving, in the Trinity of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, the same in substance, equal in power and glory; adoring the Father, infinite in Majesty, of whom are all things; confessing our Lord Jesus Christ, the Eternal Son, made very man for our salvation; glorying in His Cross and Resurrection, and owning obedience to Him as the Head over all things to His Church; trusting in the promised renewal and guidance of the Holy Spirit; proclaiming the forgiveness of sins and acceptance with God through faith in Christ, and the gift of Eternal Life; and labouring for the advancement of the Kingdom of God throughout the world. The Church of Scotland adheres to the Scottish Reformation; receives the Word of God which is contained in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as its supreme rule of faith and life; and avows the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith founded thereupon.

iv. This Church, as part of the Universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church

office-bearers, receives from Him, its Divine King and Head, and from Him alone, the right and power subject to no civil authority to legislate, and to adjudicate finally, in all matters of doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the Church. . . .

vii. The Church of Scotland, believing it to be the will of Christ that His disciples should be all one in the Father and in Him, that the world may believe that the Father has sent Him, recognizes the obligation to seek and promote union with other Churches in which it finds the Word to be purely preached, the sacraments administered according to Christ's ordinance, and discipline rightly exercised; and it has the right to unite with any such Church without loss of its identity on terms which this Church finds to be consistent with these Articles.

viii. The Church has the right to interpret these Articles, and, subject to the safeguards for deliberate action and legislation provided by the Church itself, to modify or add to them; but always consistently with the provisions of the first Article hereof, adherence to which, as interpreted by the Church, is essential to its continuity and corporate life. . . .

From the Appendix to the Uniting Act of 1929.

P. BAPTISM

1. *From The Book of Common Order*, 1940

And then he [the Minister] shall say:

DEARLY beloved,—Attend to the words of the institution of the holy Sacrament of Baptism, as delivered by our Lord and Saviour to His disciples, after His resurrection and before His ascension to the right hand of God:

> All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.

The Sacrament thus instituted is a sign and seal of our ingrafting into Christ; of forgiveness of sins by His blood, and regeneration by His Spirit; and of adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life. By this Sacrament we are solemnly admitted into His Church, and are engaged to be the Lord's.

Though little children do not understand these things, yet is the promise also to them. They are heirs of the covenant of grace; and in holy Baptism God brings them into the family and household of faith, and makes them members of Christ, and citizens of the kingdom of heaven.

2. *From The Westminster Directory*, 1643: *On the Administration of Baptism*

Prayer is also to be joined with the word of institution, for sanctifying the water to this spiritual use; and the minister is to pray to this or the like effect:

'That the Lord, who hath not left us as strangers without the covenant 'of promise, but called us to the privileges of his ordinances, would 'graciously vouchsafe to sanctify and bless his own ordinance of baptism 'at this time: That he would join the inward baptism of his Spirit with 'the outward baptism of water; make this baptism to the infant a seal 'of adoption, remission of sin, regeneration, and eternal life, and all 'other promises of the covenant of grace: That the child may be planted 'into the likeness of the death and resurrection of Christ; and that, the 'body of sin being destroyed in him, he may serve God in newness of life all his days.'

Then the minister is to demand the name of the child, which being told him, he is to say (calling the child by his name):

I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

As he pronounceth these words, he is to baptize the child with water; which, for the manner of doing it, is not only lawful but sufficient, and most expedient to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child, without adding any other ceremony.

This done, he is to give thanks and pray, to this or the like purpose:

'Acknowledging with all thankfulness, that the Lord is true and 'faithful in keeping covenant and mercy: That he is good and gracious, 'not only in that he numbereth us among his saints, but is pleased also to bestow upon our children this singular token and badge of his love in 'Christ: That, in his truth and special providence, he daily bringeth 'some into the bosom of his church, to be partakers of his inestimable 'benefits, purchased by the blood of his dear Son, for the continuance 'and increase of his church.

'And praying, That the Lord would still continue, and daily confirm 'more and more this his unspeakable favour: That he would receive 'the infant now baptized, and solemnly entered into the household of 'faith, into his fatherly tuition and defence, and remember him with the 'favour that he showeth to his people; that, if he shall be taken out of 'this life in his infancy, the Lord, who is rich in mercy, would be 'pleased to receive him up into glory; and if he live, and attain the years 'of discretion, that the Lord would so teach him by his word and Spirit, 'and make his baptism effectual to him, and so uphold him by his 'divine power and grace, that by faith he may prevail against the devil, 'the world, and the flesh, till the end he obtain a full and final victory,

'and so be kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation, 'through Jesus Christ our Lord.'

Q. OUTLINE OF THE ORDER FOR THE CELEBRATION OF HOLY COMMUNION[1]

(From the *Book of Common Order*, 1940)

The Liturgy of the Word

Introit: e.g. Ps. xliii. 3–5, in metre (or hymn appropriate to the Christian Year).
Scripture Sentences: Ps. cxvi. 12–14 *et al.*, or others to suit season.
Collect for Purity.
Confession and Absolution.
Collect to suit season.
Canticle, Psalm or Hymn.
Lesson from O.T.
Prose or Metrical Psalm.
Epistle and the Holy Gospel.
Nicene Creed.
Intercessions and Thanksgiving for All Saints (or below).
Banns of Marriage, and Intimations.
Psalm, Paraphrase, or Hymn.
Sermon, preceded by collect or 'In the Name . . .' and followed by Ascription.
Offertory: Collection of Offerings, received and placed upon the Holy Table.

The Liturgy for Holy Communion[2]

Invitation with Comfortable Words.
Psalm xxiv, or Para. xxxv, or the Hymn 'And now, O Father . . .' while Elements are brought to the Holy Table in solemn procession.
Nicene Creed, if not previously used.
Unveiling of Elements: prayer of the Veil and Offertory Prayer.
The Grace, and Warrant (1 Cor. xi. 23–26).
'Taking' of Elements.
Salutation and *Sursum corda.*
Prayer of Consecration:
Preface according to the season of the year, with Thanksgiving for Creation and Providence.
Sanctus, Benedictus qui venit with *Hosanna.*
Vere sanctus (Thanksgiving for Redemption).

[1] See too W. D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship* (1949 revision), pp. 135–6.
[2] Or 'of the Upper Room', ibid. p. 136.

Anamnesis, Oblation, Epiclesis.
Self-oblation, Oblation of the whole Church.
Doxology.
The Lord's Prayer.
Words of Institution accompanied by Manual Acts (Fraction, &c.).
Agnus Dei and Celebrant's Communion.
Delivery and People's Communion, followed by the Peace.
Post-Communion Thanksgiving, and Prayer for continuation in the Communion of Saints.
Ps. ciii. 1–5 in metre, or other Psalm or Hymn of Praise.
The Blessing.
Nunc Dimittis or Paraphrase.

R. CONTINUITY OF THE MINISTRY

'This carefully guarded transmission of ministerial commission within the Body is the essential and obvious fact of "apostolic succession". No man can take unto himself the ministry. One recalls how strong this sense of continuity was among the Covenanters: Richard Cameron went to Rotterdam to be regularly ordained by three presbyters in the year before his death on Aird's Moss. In all the Scottish Church divisions and secessions the fabric of presbytery was carefully preserved, and all ordinations were carried through "by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by those preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong".

'This one essential Ministry of Word and Sacrament in the Church is obscured by the Anglican manner by speaking of three orders of ministry: bishop, priest, or presbyter, and deacon. The episcopate, the presbyterate and the diaconate really refer to different spheres of jurisdiction, while there is only one essential ministry in the Church. This is alike the Reformed and the Roman Catholic view of "ordo". The one "ordo" in Roman teaching is "sacerdotium", expressed in the Roman bishop removing his episcopal ring, the token of jurisdiction, when, as priest, he ordains a priest.

'Of this continuity of ministry in the Church the laying-on of hands is the sign, but, as always, it is important not to confuse the sign and the thing signified. If the episcopal sign of continuity were felt to be more telling and serviceable, it could be adopted, without changing the emphasis from continuity of the One Ministry of the Church of God within the on-going life of the Body of Christ.

'The objective and effective character of the ministry is as Christ's ever-renewed gift to the Church, an objectivity and efficacy lifted above the intention of any individual minister and apart from his personal worthiness. It is Christ's Ministry, not man's.'

R. STUART LOUDEN: Address on 'The Holy Ministry' to the Scottish Church Society, 1957.

INDEX

Ainslie, J. L., 96
Alexander of Hales, 34
Absolution, 50, 53, 101
Adam, the Second, 2
Adoption, 23f.
à Lasco, John, 91
Alms, 5, 112
Ambrose, St., of Milan, 81
Analogy of Faith, the, 57
Apostles, 1, 2, 57, 74, 75, 91
  calling of, 74
  censorship of, 57
  doctrine, 75, 91, 96
  functions of, 2, 3, 31f., 74, 76, 96
  teaching of, 63
  tradition of, 57, 74
Apostolic and Catholic Fathers, 71
Apostolic Constitutions, 85, 87
Apostolic Deposit, 10
Apostolic Succession: *see* Ministerial Succession
Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, 85
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 88, 92
Arianism, 67
Assembly, General, Acts of, 47, 63, 85, 94 (*see also* Scotland, Ch. of), 101, 102, 115, 120
Athanasius, St., 66
Atonement, *see* Christ
Augustine of Hippo, St., 12, 33, 66

Baillie, D. M., 14, 39
Baillie, John, 50
Balfour, Lord, of Burleigh, 96
Baptism, Holy: *see* Sacraments
Barkley, J. M., 64, 90
Benediction, 5, 18, 31, 47, 49, 50, 53
Biblical Doctrine of Baptism, The, 26, 36, 37
Bingham, J., 16
Binning, Hugh, 56
Bishop (*see also* Episcopate, Presbyter), 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90n., 91, 118f.
  in Baptism, Confirmation, 32-6
'Bishop of the Scots', 70
Book of Common Order (Knox), 47, 49, 64, 99, 101, 115f.
Book of Common Order, 1940, 21, 36, 50, 64, 121, 123f.
Boston, Thomas, 7, 23
Boyd, Robert, of Trochrig, 107
Bright, W., 40
Bruce, Robert, 16, 17, 18, 19, 23, 44
Burleigh, J. H. S., 68

Brightman, F. E., 49
Brownlee, W. H., 82

Calderwood, D., 47, 91, 95, 114, 119
Calvin, John, 3, 4, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 31, 34, 42, 43, 45, 46, 78, 79, 81, 86, 90, 93, 99, 100, 109, 110, 112, 113
Campbell, J. McLeod, 41
Candlish, J. S., 7, 26
Carey, K. M., 105
Catechisms:
  Larger Westminster, 4, 15, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 44, 51, 77
  Shorter Westminster, 11, 18, 20, 25, 64
  Calvin's Geneva, 4, 18, 19, 21, 25, 65
  Craig's, 15, 19, 25, 116f.
  Duncan's Latin, 19, 25
  Heidelberg, 8, 25, 65
  New, 25
Chalcedon, Council of, 62
Children, status in Church, 7, 25ff., 51f., 121
Charles, R. H., 82
Christ, our Lord Jesus (*see also* God), 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15
  Advent and Final Glory, 5, 53
  Ascension, 2, 3, 14, 15, 53
  Atonement, 5
    benefits of, 15
  Blood of, in Baptism, 28
  Body, 2, 3, 7, 14, 23
  Body and Blood, 13, 38-47 *passim*, 53, 110, 115
  death, 2, 14, 51, 53
  fulness of, 6, 7
  in Baptism, 22
  in Sacraments generally, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21
  Incarnation, 1, 5, 13, 14, 16, 53
  Kingdom, 3, 4, 6, 24
  life, 14
  Lord, 4
  mediation of, 3, 14
  memorial of, 5
  mind of, 4, 8
  ordinances set by, 3
  Passion of, 14
  peace of, 6
  presence of, 8
  Priest, 4, 5, 55
  Prophet, 4
  Redeemer, 4
  Resurrection of, 2, 3, 5, 14, 51, 53

Christ—*cont.*
Sacrifice of, 112f.
Second Adam, 24
self-communication of, 15
self-consecration of, 6
Spouse of, 7
will of, 6, 14
Word of, 12, 20
Church, the, 2, 3, 4, 56, 57, 58, 59, 63, 65, 72, 75, 77, 82, 96, 98, 114, 115
Apostolic, 10, 24
authority of the, 4
Body of Christ, 3, 97, 105
calling of the, 4
Catholic, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 62, 71, 72, 104, 120
City of God, 3
continuity of the, 9, 114
Courts of the, 91, 92, 101
discipline, 6
Early, 16, 28
Eastern, 33, 35, 62, 83
foundation of the, 1
function of members, 4
Gentile, 80
government of (*see also* Courts), 9
holiness of the, 6
Holy Flock, 2, 6
House and Family of God, 7, 26
Jewish-Christian, 80
Kingdom of Christ, 3, 7
of God, 2, 25f., 28f.
kingly calling of the, 6
mission of the, 103
national or local, 8, 9
Alexandria, 86
Armenia, 86
Asia Minor, 84
Celtic, 70
Corinth, 86
Egypt, 84, 87
England, 43f., 91
France, 91
Germany, 91
Hungary, 91
Jerusalem, 62n., 80, 81n.
Philippi, 86
Rome, 9, 10, 34, 35, 44, 45, 60, 85, 86, 87, 107
Scandinavia, 91
Scotland, *see separate heading*
Switzerland, 91
One, 1, 8, 72, 104, 114, 117
Ordinances, 3, 4, 8, 9, 11, 12
pastoral function, 6
priestly calling, 5
signs of the, 115, 118
society of New Covenant, 2
stewardship in, 4, 7
visible and invisible, 6, 8, 9, 72
Western, 90
witness to Truth, 4
Clement, St., of Rome, 83, 84, 85
Columba, St., 69
Columban, St., 70
Communion, Holy, *see* Sacraments
Confession, 41
Confessions of Faith, 9, 63, 65, 66
Helvetic, Second, 10, 64, 65, 66, 72, 92
Scots, 1560, 2, 9, 13, 17, 43, 45, 66, 67, 95, 104, 114, 115
Westminster, 3, 4, 7, 8, 17, 18, 20, 21, 28, 43, 44, 56, 58, 63, 66, 68, 72, 77, 100, 119f.
Confirmation, 31ff., 50, 88, 89, 94
Conscience, 58
Constantine, Emperor, 12
Constantinople, Council of, 62
Conversion, 23, 52
Cooper, James, 85
Councils, the Ecumenical (*see also* Nicaea), 10, 62, 65, 66
Covenant: of Grace, 1, 2, 13, 38
in Baptism, 29, 38, 52
Cox, J. T., 101, 102
Craig, John, 8, 15, 17, 19, 25, 66, 116ff.
Creation, 1
the New, 2, 14
Creeds, 9, 40, 48, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65
Apostles', 29, 61, 62, 64, 116
Athanasian, 65
Catholic, 61, 62
difficulty in tracing primitive history of, 61
function of, 62
Nicene, 62, 64, 65f., 123
Cripps, T., 94
Cullmann, O., 38, 61
Cunningham, J., 94

Daube, D., 81
David I, St., 69
Declaratory Act, 1889, 68
Declaratory Articles, 1929, 120f.
Denney, J., 60, 66
Diaconate, 92, 102ff.
in relation to Baptism, 27
Dickinson, W. Croft, 91
Didache, 32, 46, 84
Didascalia, 84
Directory for the Public Worship of God, 21n, 22, 28, 39, 43, 49, 64, 122f.
Divine Law, 59
Dix, G., 81
Doctrine (*see also* Faith, the), 10, 56-71 *passim*

Donaldson, Gordon, 91
Duchesne, Mgr. L., 88
Duke, J. A., 68
Duncan, A., 19
Duns Scotus, 88

Ehrhardt, A., 74, 80
Elders, 74, 80, 81, 83, 85, 98, 99f.
  duties of, 101f.
  laity of, 101f.
Elements, Sacramental, 19, 20, 38-47 *passim*, 49
English Presbyterians, 67
English Puritanism, 64
Ephesus, Council of, 62
Epiphanius, 82
Episcopate (*see also* Bishop, Presbyter)
  an institution, not an Ordinance, 69
  collegiate, 105
  diocesan, 70
  monarchical, 85, 86, 87, 105
  office of, 89, 118
  plural, 106
  restriction of presbyterate, 89
Erskine of Dun, John, 91, 118f.
Eucharist (*see* Communion, Holy)
Eutyches, 67
Excommunication, 101

Faith, the Catholic, 4, 6, 9, 10, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 66
  analogy of, 57n.
  content of, 57
  delivery of, 63
  essentials of, 60
  formula of, 62
  in process of transmission, 57
  'once delivered', 57, 59, 61, 71
  outlines of, 60
  rule of, 59
  unwritten, 57
Faith, its place in Sacraments, 20, 21, 25, 41, 116
Fasting, 72, 92, 93
Forbes, John, of Corse, 23, 107
Forbes, Patrick, 80
Form of Presbyterial Church Government, 5, 50, 72, 73, 74, 91, 92, 94

Gillespie, George, 3, 80, 93, 94, 102
Girig, 69
Gladstone, W. E., 59
Gnostics, 33
God:
  City of, 3
  freedom of, 12
  hand of, 58
  in Baptism, 22f., 26
  in Scripture, 56
  Kingdom of, 2, 5, 7
  Mysteries of, 78, 91
  purpose of, 7
  throne of, 3
  the Holy Trinity, 22, 27, 61, 64, 68, 76
  the Father, 1, 4, 5, 6, 53, 61, 103
    Kingdom of, 2
    name of, 5
    promises of, 2
  The Son (*see also* Christ), 56, 57, 60, 61, 65, 74, 75, 76
    Apostle of God, 76
    essential Deity of, 67
    High Priest, 76f.
    Incarnation, 57, 67, 68
    King of the Church, 71, 104
    Living Word, 96
    Lord, 57
    Mediator, 103
    mystery of, 97
    Only-Begotten, 57
    only minister of Grace, 77
    principal ordainer, 57
    promise of, 97
    Saviour, 58
    Two Natures of, 62, 65, 66
  The Holy Spirit, 3, 4, 5, 12, 15, 57, 58, 61, 72
    communion of, 103
    gifts of, 100
    interior operations of, 12, 58
    Person of, 62, 65, 66
    power of, 57n.
    promise of, 71
    providence of, 57
    Spirit of Truth, 57
    testimony of, 58
Godhead, fulness of, 57
Gore, C., 81, 87, 88, 105, 106
Gospel, the, 2, 15, 23, 45, 46, 48, 59, 60, 77, 103
  Apostolic, 59
  everlasting, 57
  'mysteries of', 63, 67
  oral, 61
  primitive, 62
  reconciliation, 103, 104
Grace:
  Baptismal, 51
  extraordinary, 11f.
  meaning of, 17
  means of, 2, 11, 42
  of Christ, 3, 18, 53, 54
  sacramental, 17, 18, 22f., 26
Gratian, Edict of, 10
Gregory the Great, Pope, 36, 49
Gwatkin, H. M., 85

Hall, A. C. A., 34
Hall, Joseph, 34
Heaven, 3, 5
Henderson, Alexander, 47, 92, 93, 100
Henderson, G. D., 3n., 99, 104
Hermas of Rome, 85
Hill, G., 74, 94
Hippolytus, 32, 33, 85
Holiness, 6, 14
Hooker, R., 79

Ignatius, St., of Antioch, 61, 84, 85
Immortality, 14
Imposition of Hands: *see* Laying-on of hands
Intercession, 5, 42, 28, 123
Irenaeus of Lyons, 85, 88
Irving, Edward, 67
Israel, 2, 14
  the New, 2

James II and VII, 67
Jeremias, J., 82
Jerome, St., 36, 107
Justin Martyr, St., 32, 46, 83
Justinian, Emperor, 10

Keith, R., 10
Kelly, J. N. D., 62
Kemp, E. W., 84, 105, 106
Kentigern, St., 69
Kirk Session, 101
  as Sponsors in Baptism, 27
Kirk, K. E., 81, 87
Knox, John, 7, 8, 10, 41, 47, 64, 66, 90, 91, 95, 99, 101, 115f.

Laing, D., 10
Lampe, G. W. H., 31, 33, 35, 80
Lay Baptism, 27
Lateran Council, the Fourth, 46
Laying-on of Hands (*see also* Confirmation), 16, 31f., 73, 75, 83, 92, 93, 95
  benediction, 92
  Confirmation, 92 (*et ad loc.*)
  necessity in C. of S., 93
  on penitents, 92
Leo XIII, Pope, 35, 107
Lightfoot, J. B., 47n., 105
Lindsay, T. M., 5n., 80, 81, 82, 83
Lord's Prayer, the, 49, 74, 105
Louden, R. S., 125

MacAlpine, Kenneth, 69
Macdonald, A. J. D., 94, 98, 106
MacEwen, A. R., 68n.
McKerrow, J., 100
MacLeod, John, 47, 80
MacMillan, W. M., 95
Mair, W., 102
Malcolm III (Canmore), 69, 70
Manson, W., 5, 50
Manual of Discipline (Qumran), 82
Marcion, 67
Margaret, St., 70
Marriage, 50
Marriott, Sir J. A. R., ix
Martin, A., 94
Maxwell, W. D., 29, 46, 47, 64, 123
Middle Ages, 16
Milligan, Wm., 3
Milne, I. A., 91
Ministry, the Holy, 2, 3, 4, 5, 72ff., 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 107, 118
  Apostolic, 81
  continuity of, 124f.
  degrees of Order in, 86
  dependent on the Word, 96, 105
  Divine Ordinance, 75
  first depository of the Keys, 76
  gifts derived from our Lord and given by Holy Ghost, 75
  ground and justification, 75
  guardian of doctrine, 79
  idea of three orders, 90
  institution of, 72
  lawful, 97
  nucleus of Church, 76
  official, 118
  Orders of, 79
  ordinary and extraordinary, 79
  our Lord directly present in, 78
  parity in, 91
  pastoral, 50
  responsibility to Christ alone, 79
  stewardship, 74, 78
  two-fold derivation of, 75
  two kinds of ordinary, 86
Moberley, R. C., 77
Molland, E., 85, 88, 105
Morinus, J., 90, 107
Morton, James Douglas, Fourth Earl, 91
Mysterion, 16

Neale, J. M., 36
Nestorius, 67
Nicaea, Council of, 62, 84, 86, 88
Niesel, W., 49

Order, 103ff.
  permanent and variable elements, 104
Ordinance, 11-55, *passim*
Ordination, 9, 16, 50, 72, 82, 89, 91ff.
  essentials of, 72, 91, 92, 93, 94
  spiritual act, 92

Palladius, 88
Paradise, 7
Parents at Baptism, 27, 30, 37
Parker, T. H. L., 58n.
Paton, D. M., 95
Patrick, St., 68
Penance, 34, 92
Pentecost, 2, 3
Praise, 5, 41, 48
Prayer, 11, 15, 41, 48ff., 72, 92, 93
Presbyter, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 88, 89, 90n., 91, 92, 98
  in Baptism, 27, 32
  in Confirmation, 35f.
  Reformed, 9
Presbytery, 100, 101, 106
Presence, the Real, 44ff., 110f.
  in terms of Chalcedonian theology, 44n.
Priesthood:
  of Christ, 4, 5, 55
  Roman, 9
  royal, 113f.
Protestant, distinct from Reformed, 64

Rabin, C., 82
Rawlinson, A. E. J., 35, 93
Reconciliation, 78, 103, 104
Redemption, 15
Reformed Churches, 31, 64
Reformation, the, 9, 46, 49, 63, 65, 90, 91, 102
  of Church from within, 70ff.
Reformers, the, 9, 16, 46, 90, 91
Regeneration, 22, 25, 32
Reid, J. K. S., 74
Repentance, 23, 26, 53
Resurrection, the General, 15, 60
Revelation, 56, 57, 58, 74, 96, 103
  record of, 58
  wholly providential, 58
Robertson, W., 67
Robinson, J. Armitage, 74, 80
Ross, J. M., 100, 102

Sacraments, 2, 4, 11, 13-55
  of Old Testament, 13
  of New Testament, 14
  Holy Baptism, 16, 21ff., 50f., 61, 64, 65, 76, 77, 88, 89, 96, 97, 104
    conditional, 28
    infant, 36f.
    lay, 27
    mode of, 28, 121, 122f.
    repetition is sacrilege, 27f.
  Holy Communion, 16, 38-47, 53ff., 62, 64, 76, 77, 82, 83, 84, 85, 88, 97, 102, 115
    admission to, 28ff.
    Calvin on, 109
    celebration a Ministerial act, 101n., 109f.
    frequency of, 46f., 112
    Order of, 48f., 112, 123f.
    Real Presence, 44f., 110f.
  Holy Spirit in, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, 26, 53, 54
Sacramentum, 16
Sacrifice of alms and praises, 5
Saints, the, 8, 117
Salvation, 14, 15, 21, 26, 53, 56, 58
Schmaus, M., 79
Scriptures, the Holy, 56ff., 57, 59, 62, 63, 67, 91, 104
  authority of, 58, 67
  of Old Testament, 13, 57n., 99
  of New Testament, 10, 13, 14, 16, 56, 57, 58, 63, 74, 82, 83, 96
  rule of, 58
  Word of God in, 58
Scotland, Church of, 10, 17, 21, 25, 27, 36, 43, 44, 49, 54, 64, 74, 77, 79, 80, 90, 91, 93, 97, 98, 101, 105, 120f.
  Catholicity, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68ff., 120
  Celtic elements, 69, 70
  continuity of, 68
  General Assembly, 64, 100, 101
  Law of, 64
  Ministry, *vis-à-vis* Roman and Anglican, 94
  Moderate Party in, 67
  origin of, 68
  primacy in, 69
  Reformed, 64
  seceders from, 67
  standards of, 102
Smeton, Thomas, 91
Socianism, 67
Spirit, the Holy, *see* God
Sponsors at Baptism, 27, 30
Sprott, Wm., 27, 29, 47, 49, 50
Steuart, W., of Pardovan, 80, 92, 94, 100, 101, 102
Stone, D., 105
Succession, Ministerial, 95, 124
Superintendents, office of, 91, 118f.
Symbolism in Sacraments, 19
Synagogue, 81, 82

Telfer, W., 105, 106
Tertullian, 32, 68
Testamentum Domini, 84
Theodosius, Emperor, 10
Torrance, T. F., 8, 9, 10, 75, 89
Tradition, oral, 61
Transubstantiation, 44
Trent, Council of, 34
Trinity, the Holy, *see* God
Tuathal, 69

Turner, C. H., 87

Unction, 32, 33

Valentinian, Emperor, 10
Vernet, F., 88
Visitation, pastoral, 50

Walker, T., 95
Warden, John, 22
Warr, C. L., 102
William III, 67
Willison, John, 23
Wilpert, J., 85
Wodrow, R., 67
Woolcombe, K. J., 105
Word, the, 4, 11, 15, 48, 56ff.
Wordsworth, J., 36, 86, 88, 89, 106
World, the, 4, 5
Worship, 5, 39, 47ff., 115
Wotherspoon, H. J., 35n., 50n., 59
Wright, R. Selby, 68

Zadokite Fragments, 82

140877 285.2R
Wotherspoon, Henry Johnstone L0913.2
A manual of church doctrine.

285.2R
L0913.2
140877